The University of Chicago

THE HEBREW PARTICLE אשׁר

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS
AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES)

BY
CARL GAENSSLE

STANFORD UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES
WITHDRAWN

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

3781
C53G
UNCLASSED
Dissertation

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Agents

THE CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
LONDON AND EDINBURGH

THE MARUZEN-KABUSHIKI-KAISHA
TOKYO, OSAKA, KYOTO

KARL W. HIERSEMANN
LEIPZIG

THE BAKER & TAYLOR COMPANY
NEW YORK

The University of Chicago

THE HEBREW PARTICLE אשר

A DISSERTATION

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF THE GRADUATE SCHOOL OF ARTS
AND LITERATURE IN CANDIDACY FOR THE DEGREE
OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

(DEPARTMENT OF SEMITIC LANGUAGES AND LITERATURES)

BY
CARL GAENSSLE

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS

Published March 1915

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U.S.A.

CONTENTS

Part I. אשר as a Nota Relationis[1]

A. The Etymology of אשר

PAGE

a) Various Etymological Theories 7

1. Reference to Older Theories as to the Relation between אשר and ש.
2. Recent Theories.
3. Theory of the Priority of אשר. The View of Ewald.
4. Theory of the Priority of ש.
5. The Views of Boettcher and Wright.
6. Theory of the Substantive Origin of אשר.

b) Theory of the Common Pronominal Origin of אשר and ש Examined 9

7– 8. General Objections.
9–10. Criticism of Ewald's View.
11–14. Criticism of Boettcher's View.
15–18. Criticism of Sperling's View.

c) The Substantive Origin of אשר 19

19–24. Traces of Substantive Origin in the Adverbial Use of אשר.
25–32. The Adverbial Use of אשר without Analogy in the Demonstratives of Other Semitic Dialects.
33–39. The Close Analogy between אשר and the Assyrian a š a r.
40. Objection against the Substantive Origin of אשר Considered.
41–45. Analogies from Other Languages.

B. The Syntactic Relation of אשר

a) Criticism of Baumann's Theory 32

46–50. Baumann's Theory of the Syntax of אשר.
51–53. Baumann's Theory Involves the Assumption That Two Successive Demonstratives May Belong to the Same Antecedent.
54. A Point of Difference between the Relative Use of זֶה and זוּ, and אשר.
55–57. Comparison with Other Semitic Dialects.
58–61. אשר Following Demonstratives Used Alone.

b) Substantive Relative Clauses 41

[1] Cf. sec. 39, note.

PAGE

1. *Substantive Relative Clauses as Subject*

62. Syntactic Position of אשר according to Boettcher-Baumann and Gesenius-Kautzsch Grammar.
63–65. Objections against This View.

2. *Substantive Relative Clauses as Object*

66. Examples Illustrating Baumann's Theory.
67–68. Objections against the Theory. Importance Attached to את Preceding אשר.
69. Object Relative Clauses without את.

3. *Substantive Relative Clauses Depending on a Preposition*

70. Clauses with אשר.
71. Clauses without אשר.

4. *Relative Clauses in Construct State*

72. Clauses with אשר.
73. Clauses without אשר.

c) אשר A VAGUE MEDIUM OF RELATION 50

74–76. Used as a Connective Indicating Neither a Relative Nor a Conjunctional Subordination.
77. Does the Duty of a Partitive Genitive.
78. Takes the Place of an Accusative of Result.
79. Expresses Attendant Circumstance.
80. Expresses Means (?).
81. Dispenses with Adjuncts Ordinarily Employed.
82. After Time-Determinations.

d) אשר IN CLAUSES OF SPECIFICATION 55

83–86. אשר-Clauses the Equivalent of an Accustive of Specification.

e) MISCELLANEOUS 58

87. אשר with an Entire Sentence as Antecedent.
88. Construed Like the Indo-European Relative.
89. Attraction of Antecedent. *Satzverflechtung.*
90. Relative Clause Precedes Antecedent.
91. Removed from Antecedent by Intervening Words.
92. Continues an Idea Begun by a Participle.

f) THE RETROSPECTIVE COMPLEMENT 63

93–96. Weakness of Baumann's View Regarding the Syntactic Importance of the 'Aîd.
97. View of König as to the Origin of the 'Aîd.
98–100. Erroneous Statements of Gesenius-Kautzsch Grammar with Reference to the Suppression of the 'Aîd.

PAGE

PART II. THE CONJUNCTIONAL USE OF אשר AND ITS COMPOUNDS

a) אשר USED ALONE 71

101– 2. General Remarks.
103. אשר in Subject Clauses.
104– 6. In Object Clauses.
107. In Causal Clauses.
108– 9. In Causal Relative Clauses.
110–11. In Pure Final Clauses.
112. In Complementary Final Clauses.
113. In Final Relative Clauses.
114. In Consecutive Clauses.
115. In a Complementary Consecutive Clause.
116. In Consecutive Relative Clauses.
117. In Conditional Clauses.
118–34. In Conditional Relative Clauses.
135–38. In Explicative Clauses.
139. In Concessive Clauses.
140. In Concessive Relative Clauses.
141. In Temporal Clauses.
142–43. In Modal Clauses.
144. אשר *Recitativum.*

b) אשר IN COMPOUNDS 105

145–47. אשר as a Rule Dispensed with. כְּ and כַּאֲשֶׁר.

כאשר *in Comparative Clauses*

148–54. כאשר Equivalent to "According to That Which," the אשר Retaining Its Force as a Relative Particle.
155–57. כאשר Equivalent to "According to the Fact or Circumstance That," the אשר Revealing Its Conjunctional Force.
158. כאשר Introducing an Assumed Comparison.
159. Equivalent to *quo* . . . . [*eo*].
160–61. In Temporal Clauses.
162. In Causal Clauses.

באשר

163. As a Causal Conjunction.

על אשר

164–65. Causal.
166. Used Concessively.

על־דבר אשר

167. Causal.

על־כל־אדות אשר

168–69. Emphatically Causal.

על־פי אשר

170. In Proportion to, According as.

כפי אשר

171. According as (with Causal Connotation).
172. כפי Used Alone.

יען אשר

173–74. Used Prevailingly in Divine Threats and Promises.
175. An Unusual Use of.
176–80. External Form in יען אשר-Clauses.

עקב אשר

181–82. In Consequence of the Fact That.

תחת אשר

183. In Its Primary Sense (Instead of . . . .).
184–87. In a Causal Sense.

אחר (אחרי אשר)

188–89. Strictly Temporal.
190. With Causal *Nuance*.
191. אחר אשר Instead of "אחרי.
192. אשר Dispensed with.
193. Unusual Forms.

עד אשר

194–95. With Imperfect Denoting Future Action.
196. עד אשר and Similar Compounds with Perfect Denoting Future Action.
197. With Final Connotation.
198–99. With Perfect Denoting Past Action.
200. In the Sense of "To the Point or Degree That."
201. In Nominal Sentences.
202. עד אשר־עד־כה.
203. עד Used Alone.

למען אשר

204– 7. To the End That.
208. Sporadic Cases of Compounds with אשר.

THE HEBREW PARTICLE אשר

PART I. אשר AS A *NOTA RELATIONIS*

A. THE ETYMOLOGY OF אשר

a) VARIOUS ETYMOLOGICAL THEORIES

1. Since there are two relatives in Hebrew, אשר and שׁ, of similar grammatical usage, it is quite natural that grammarians have sought to trace them to a common origin. The older attempts, referred to by Sperling,[1] to trace both to verbal roots are so manifestly arbitrary and artificial that we shall not waste time in mentioning or discussing them.

2. In recent times other theories have been offered. According to some scholars אשר and שׁ look to a common pronominal root, while others hold that there is no etymological relation between the two, שׁ only being regarded as pronominal in character, while אשר is derived from a substantive.

3. Among those again who maintain the pronominal derivation of both particles there is no agreement as to how the two distinct forms arose. Some scholars hold that אשר is the original form of which שׁ is said to be a mutilated fragment. Olshausen says, for example, that the form שׁ is a remnant of אשר by the elision of א and the assimilation of ר to the consonant of the following word.[2] So also Gesenius, who calls שׁ a *forma decurtata* of אשר.[3] With this

[1] *Die nota relationis im Hebräischen* (Leipzig, 1876).

[2] *Lehrbuch der hebräischen Sprache* (Braunschweig, 1861), p. 439.

[3] *Thesaurus, s.v.*

view may be classed the theory of Ewald, inasmuch as he also assigns the priority to אשר, although he gives his own explanation of the origin of this form. In the opinion of this great scholar אשר is made up of three demonstrative elements, ש (=ת, ד, ז), ל, and א, resulting in the form אשל, analogous to the Arabic الّذى. From this אשל arose the form אשר through the hardening of the ל, while the ש is supposed to be due to the assimilation of ל and the rejection of א.[1]

4. Others, as indicated, reverse the relation between the two particles, assigning the priority to ש, of which the form אשר is supposed to be an extended formation. Sperling devotes many pages to the elaboration of his theory of a progressive development from an original ש through the Phoenician אש(ש) to the final אשר in Hebrew. He, too, in common with Ewald, holds that אשר is due to the hardening of ל in אשל to ר. Thus, while accepting the Ewaldian form אשל, Sperling contends that this אשל represents the final stage in the development of ש, while it is the original ground-form according to Ewald. König, in the first volume of his elaborate grammar, favored the view of Boettcher, which derives both ש and אשר from an original של, and regards א as merely prosthetic.[2] In the second volume of the same work, however, he abandoned this view in favor of an original אשל, laying, in common with Sperling, great stress on the importance of the Phoenician אש as the connecting link between ש and אשר.[3] Substantially the same view is held by Baumann,[4] Philippi[5] ("das אשר wird demnach אשל gelautet haben"), and others.

5. Boettcher, as already stated, takes a different position. Regarding Ewald's אשל as being artificially constructed (*künstlich konstruiert*), he substituted for it the simpler של, analogous to הל, as the ground-form both of ש and of אשר, the א being prosthetic.[6] Wright, while not taking a definite position, inclines toward

[1] *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache*, 8. Ausg. (Göttingen, 1870), § 181*b*.

[2] *Historisch-krit. Lehrgeb. der hebr. Sprache* (Leipzig, 1881), I, 140.

[3] *Op. cit.*, II, 323 f.

[4] *Hebräische Relativsätze* (Leipzig, 1894), pp. 42 f.

[5] *Status constructus im Hebräischen* (Weimar, 1871), pp. 72 f.

[6] *Ausführliches Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache* (Leipzig, 1866), II, 81

the views of Ewald or Boettcher, because he prefers to "seek the origin of the relative pronoun somewhere in the region of the demonstratives."[1]

6. The difficulties with which these views are encumbered have led many scholars to regard the attempt to trace the two Hebrew relatives to a common etymological source as futile. They deny that there is any etymological relationship between them, the longer particle being in their opinion originally a substantive signifying place, the Hebrew equivalent of the Assyrian a š r u, the Arabic أَثَر, the Aramaic אֲתַר, ܐܬܪ. Among the defenders of the substantive origin of אשׁר are Fleischer, Mühlau,[2] Friedrich Delitzsch,[3] Hommel,[4] Stade[5] (who though assuming the substantive character of אשׁר still considers שׁ as a remnant of the longer particle), W. R. Harper,[6] Kraetzschmar,[7] Zimmern,[8] and, recently, Brockelmann.[9] And the writer of this thesis will endeavor to show in the following pages that this is the only tenable theory. On the other hand, the grammar of Gesenius-Kautzsch suspends its judgment with regard to the matter ("Die Etymologie ist noch immer streitig," § 138).

b) THEORY OF THE COMMON PRONOMINAL ORIGIN OF אשׁר AND שׁ EXAMINED

7. Let us now examine the various views represented by those scholars who seek to uphold the common pronominal derivation of the two particles. In general, it may be said at the outset that there is little or no noticeable resemblance between אשׁר and שׁ beyond the bare fact that the letter שׁ forms an element in אשׁר.

[1] *Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages* (Cambridge University Press, 1890), p. 118.

[2] Cf. Boettcher, *op. cit.*, II, 79, note.

[3] *Prolegomena* (Leipzig, 1886), p. 44, note.

[4] *ZDMG*, XXXII, 100 f.

[5] *Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache* (Leipzig, 1879), p. 133.

[6] *Elements of Hebrew* (Scribner, 1906), p. 63.

[7] "The Origin of the *nota relationis* in Hebrew," *Hebraica*, VI (1890), 296 f.

[8] *Vergleichende Grammatik der semitischen Sprachen* (Berlin, 1898), p. 77.

[9] *Ibid.* (Berlin, 1908), § 109 *g* and *β*.

This alone might seem to preclude the possibility of finding a common origin for both by any other than artificial combinations. However, it is a fact well known to linguistic science that words are often mutilated and disfigured beyond immediate recognition in the course of their history. Assuming then the priority of אשר, there may, after all, be no a priori reason why שׁ should not be a mere remnant of the earlier complete form, though such a radical change in the physiognomy of a word would certainly represent about the utmost limit in the process of phonetic decay. But similar changes have actually occurred in other languages. We can hardly recognize the Low Latin *aetaticum* in the English word "age," nor the Latin demonstrative *ille* in the enclitical *l* of the Roumanian *homul* (*homo ille*), yet they belong etymologically together. However, such phenomena do not warrant the assumption that the same thing has happened with אשר, for the reason that שׁ meets us *simultaneously* with אשר, already in the earlier stages of the language, whereas the examples referred to above represent the result of a long process of decay, the shorter forms not being found side by side with the full and unimpaired originals. We are, of course, well aware that שׁ is employed much more extensively in the later literature than in the earlier. But the fact remains that it is also found, though with less frequency, in the earlier writings, e.g., in the song of Deborah, which is by many regarded as the oldest monument of biblical Hebrew. Nor need we doubt that the pronominal שׁ is contained as an element in such compound names as מְתוּשָׁאֵל (Gen. 4:18), and מִישָׁאֵל (Exod. 6:21); perhaps also in בְּשַׁגַּם (Gen. 6:3). These facts are very troublesome for the theory of common origin.

8. Moreover, a glance at the corresponding forms in other Semitic languages clearly shows that שׁ is etymologically independent of אשר. It is now generally agreed that all undoubted Semitic relatives[1] (originally demonstratives) are traceable to the two demonstrative roots *ta* and *da*, the "lisped dentals forming part of the 'protosemitic' stock of sounds preserved in Arabic alone."[2] From *da* are derived the Ethiopic ዘ, Syriac ܕ, Aramaic ד, and the Arabic

[1] אשר is not included here.

[2] Wright, *Comparative Grammar*, p. 55.

ذ in اَلَّذِى ; while *ta* (the *t* passing into *š* according to the well-known law of phonetics) is the original of the Assyrian ša, the Phoenician שׁ(אשׁ), and the Hebrew שׁ. This theory, while avoiding all precarious combinations, which must arise from every attempt to connect שׁ with אשׁר, has the merit of assigning to the Hebrew שׁ a natural and fitting place in Semitic in accordance with well-established phonetic laws.

9. But let us now examine the various views of a common pronominal origin more in detail. First, those which assign the priority to אשׁר. Since Olshausen contents himself with the bare statement that שׁ is the shortened form of אשׁר without attempting any explanation of the shorter form,[1] we shall first take up the theory of Ewald. The ground-form, says this scholar, is אשׁל. Boettcher rightly objected that this form was "artificially constructed." This hypothetical אשׁל springs, in fact, from the determination to bridge over, at all hazards, the gulf between שׁ and אשׁר. Doubtless no scholar would ever have thought of resorting to such a desperate expedient, if the common pronominal origin of the two particles were not a foregone conclusion. But assuming אשׁל to have been the parent both of שׁ and of אשׁר, it would be rather singular, to say the least, that the supposed original should exhibit such diametrically opposite tendencies in its development. On the one hand, the ל hardens into ר, and the entire form in this new shape steadily and stubbornly maintains its independent existence throughout the entire period of the language. On the other, the initial א disappears entirely, ל disappears through assimilation, and the remaining fragment leans on the following word for support. We contend that this militates against all the laws of language. How can we conceive this twofold process going on at the same time and leading in exactly opposite directions? If the assumed אשׁל showed a propensity to surrender its independence and, by the rejection of א and the assimilation of ל, become a proclitic of the succeeding word, the origin of אשׁר from the same אשׁל and its steadfast continuance beside the shorter form become inexplicable.

10. As for the ל in אשׁל, this is gratuitously assumed by Ewald in order to find, what he thought, an adequate explanation for the

[1] *Lehrbuch der hebr. Sprache*, p. 439.

daghesh forte after ·שֶׁ. Ewald starts out from the theory that the daghesh necessarily implies the assimilation of a preceding letter, but this view is without foundation, as Sperling correctly objects, the daghesh being frequently found where assimilation is out of the question. The daghesh after ו consecutive, in בַּמָּה, כַּמָּה, and very likely also in such combinations as מַה־זֶּה, מַה־זֹּאת, מַה־לָּךְ, are cases in point. The sharpening here takes place in order to strengthen the preceding vowel. I say "very likely also" with reference to the daghesh after ·מַה־. It is true that Wright,[1] following Boettcher, thinks that an easy explanation for the daghesh is here found in the fact that מָה goes back to an original *mant*, which, passing successively through the intermediate stages of *matt*, *mat*, *math*, *mah* (מָהּ), finally assumed the form with an open syllable (מָה). But the very existence of the final form מָה with a quiescent ה is fatal to the foregoing explanation of the daghesh. If the development of the original *mant* had not proceeded beyond *math* or *mah* (מַהּ), in other words, if it had stopped at a point where the form still represented a *closed* syllable, the following daghesh might easily be explained on the principle of assimilation. But it went one degree farther, so that the original consonantal ending wore away entirely. Consequently the daghesh in the following word must be explained on other grounds than assimilation. There can be no doubt that the daghesh is intended to strengthen and preserve the preceding vowel. Nor can the daghesh after the Hebrew article be urged in favor of Ewald's view with respect to the doubling after ·שֶׁ. The once prevalent idea that the Hebrew article ·הַ involves the assimilation of ל, making the original הַל identical with the Arabic هَلْ, اَلْ, cannot be upheld. Barth has conclusively shown that the Hebrew article corresponds to the Arabic ها.[2] At all events, there is no inherent necessity for assuming the assimilation of ל or any other letter to account for the daghesh forte as in ·שֶׁ. Thus Ewald's whole theory, besides being extremely labored and artificial in itself, is also deprived of this imaginary support, and the probability of its correctness is reduced to a minimum.

11. Passing on to Boettcher's theory, we do not see that it carries us any farther toward a satisfactory solution of the difficulties con-

[1] *Comparative Grammar*, p. 124.

[2] *AJSL*, XIII (1896), 1 f.

nected with ש and אשר than the view of Ewald. As is well known, Boettcher assumes an original של, a by-form of הל, which, by the accession of a prosthetic א and the hardening of ל into ר, resulted in אשר, while at the same time the assumed ל gave, as before, a convenient explanation for the daghesh as in · שֶׁ. But the principal objection against Ewald's theory also applies here. If the original was של, it is not easy to understand how on the one hand the form should tend to grow and strive after independence by taking on the א and hardening its ל into ר, while on the other hand it should so weaken as to become a feeble proclitic of the following word. This של owes its origin to nothing else than the fiat of its author, who postulated it as an open-sesame in the effort to derive ש and אשר from a common source. There is nothing that corresponds with של in any Semitic tongue. A posteriori Boettcher looks around and finds an abundant variety of "proofs" for the correctness of his view. Foremost among these is the fact that the *spiritus asper* (*h*) and *š* (*sh*) are found in some instances to correspond in Semitic. Boettcher calls attention to such forms as שלהבת and הלהבת, שכלל and הכלל; also to similar phenomena in Indo-European, e.g., ἅλλομαι and *salio*, ἅλς and *sal*. But apart from the fact that in so doing he is plainly begging the question, there is no undoubted instance of such interchange between ה and ש in Hebrew, the שלהבת being a shafel-formation borrowed from the Aramaic.[1] As for the ה and ש of the causative stems, there is as yet no consensus of opinion among Semitic scholars as regards the mutual relation of these formations. Some of the most noted Semitists either leave the matter of their original identity an open question or deny that such identity ever existed. Zimmern, for example, says with reference to *šaqtala* and *haqtala* that it is impossible to decide whether we have here "two originally separate formations,"[2] or whether *haqtala* is a descendant of *šaqtala* by phonetic change. Brockelmann, on the other hand, declares that the prefixes ša, ha, and 'a cannot be traced to a single ground-form, whence it must be assumed that they existed side by side in protosemitic.[3] Wright, however, it

[1] Cf. Gesenius, *Handwörterbuch, s.v.;* also König, *Lehrgeb. der hebr. Sprache*, II, 404.

[2] *Von Haus aus verschiedene Bildungen;* cf. *Vergleichende Grammatik der semit. Sprachen*, p. 88.

[3] *Ibid.*, pp. 520 f.

is only fair to add, holds that *š* and *h* in these stems were originally identical, *š* having changed into *h*.[1] Thus the theory of Boettcher is seen to rest on a very slender foundation, so far as this interchange of ה and שׁ is concerned.

12. But there are other difficulties besetting the Boettcher theory besides those of phonetics. If הֵל is only a by-form of שֵׁל,[2] it is not easy to explain why such a by-form should come into existence at all. Why should not the original שׁל, abbreviated into ·שׁ, have sufficed, especially within the same language? Such a duality of forms is unparalleled within the range of Semitic demonstratives. The Assyrian has ša as a demonstrative relative, but not a trace of a corresponding form with *h*. It also has šu, but not a coexistent by-form hu. Assuming then that שׁל was the primary form, we should expect to find it employed (in its abbreviated form) as the Hebrew article, and the more so, since, as already stated, there is no interchange between שׁ and ה in Hebrew. Again, if the two forms spring from a single stock, we should naturally expect to find some trace of agreement in grammatical usage. But such agreement is nowhere to be found. שׁ is never used as an article, while ה performs almost exclusively that function,[3] a fact that stands in glaring contrast with the analogy of the causative verbal stems in שׁ and ה, which have practically the same significance.

13. "Die Form אשׁר," says Boettcher, "hat sich erst mit der Sonderstellung von שֶׁל erhärtet."[4] This is the way in which Boettcher conceives the transition from the shorter to the longer form. שֶׁל with a change of the original vowel is supposed to represent the intermediate stage in the evolution toward אשׁר. Thus both the daghesh after ·שׁ (before the *Sonderstellung*) and the ־ֶ in אֲשֶׁר were accounted for—but on the impossible assumption that the same particle *simultaneously detached* itself *from* and *attached* itself *to* the succeeding word.[5]

[1] *Comparative Grammar*, pp. 204 f.

[2] Boettcher calls שֵׁל a by-form of הֵל, but taking their original unity for granted, the reverse of this is the true relation, שֵׁל being the earlier form.

[3] In a few sporadic instances the Hebrew article, originally a demonstrative, is used as a relative.

[4] *Ausführl. Lehrbuch.*, etc., I, 153.

[5] There is, of course, a form שֶׁל, but this, being modeled on the analogy of the Aramaic דִּי, has no connection with Boettcher's שֵׁל.

14. Also the supposition that the א is merely prosthetic is open to criticism. The *Aleph prostheticon* is employed to "lighten the pronunciation of an unpleasant combination of consonants" (Wright). In other words, the prosthetic vowel is used on grounds of euphony. We find it in such words as begin with two consonants, the first of which is vowelless, e.g., אֶזְרוֹעַ for זְרוֹעַ; אִתְמוֹל for תְּמוֹל. So also in Arabic, Syriac, and biblical Aramaic. There are also numerous analogies in modern languages; cf. in English *special* and *especial*, *state* and *estate;* the English *stomach* and the French *estomac*, *spirit* and *esprit;* the German *sklave* and the French *esclave*. Also the Greek *χθές* and *ἐχθές*, *ἀσπαίρω* and *σπαίρω* exemplify the same principle. In all cases, it will be seen, the prefixing of an initial vowel springs from grounds of euphony, the words beginning with two consonants in immediate juxtaposition. But no such grounds for the addition of an initial vowel exist in the case under consideration. A word so easily pronounced and so frequently used as would be the case with the שׁל in question would hardly burden itself with a wholly superfluous prosthetic א, especially since the whole tendency of language in the case of frequently used particles is rather toward abbreviation than extension.

15. We now come to consider the opposite theory. May not אשׁר be a *Weiterbildung* of שׁ without assuming either an אשׁל or a שׁל as the ground-form? This is, as remarked, the view of Sperling, which he elaborates with much labor and skill. While Sperling is unquestionably right in vindicating for the particle שׁ an original place in Semitic, he is on very uncertain ground, when he contends that the original form was שֵׁ. The corresponding Assyrian form ša, from which the Hebrew particle cannot be etymologically separated, makes this view extremely improbable, to say the least.[1] Kraetzschmar already called attention to the fact that the Assyrian ša had originally a long vowel, being written ša-a in the syllabaries, though when employed for literary purposes in the inscriptions it invariably appears as šă.[2] It is to be noted, however, that the long form ša-a occurs frequently in the Amarna Tablets. In Hebrew the long vowel is found in שָׁאַתָּה (Judg. 6:17), more frequently, however, ·שֵׁ with

[1] König thinks that the Hebrew may have occupied a *Sonderstellung* with reference to ša; cf. *Lehrgeb.*, II, 323.

[2] *BA*, I, 382.

the shortening of the vowel and the compensative daghesh. This also favors an original long vowel. But the commonest forms of our particle are · שֶׁ and שֶׁ, even שִׁ being found. This has led some scholars to believe that ֶ must have been the original vowel. But besides the fact, already referred to, that the Assyrian ša-a and ša stand directly opposed to this view, the change from *a* to *e* is quite common in Hebrew, and, therefore, the transition from ša to še constitutes no such difficulty as, for instance, König supposes.[1] We need only refer to the ֶ of the article before the gutturals ה, ע, and ה; or to מֶה instead of מָה, which is found not only before gutturals (מֶה־חָטָאתִי, מֶה־עָשִׂיתָ, etc.), but before other consonants as well, e.g., עַל־מֶה תֻּכּוּ (Isa. 1:5), מֶה לִּידִידִי (Jer. 11:15), מֵה לַעֲשׂוֹת for מַה־לְּ, and numerous other instances.[2] The same change is found in verbal and nominal forms. Cf. שָׁאַלְתִּי with שֶׁאֲלֹתֵם, and the segholate forms אֶרֶץ, גֹּפֶן, קֶרֶן, originally pronounced אַרְצִ, גַּפְנִ, קַרְנִ, as is plainly seen not only from the corresponding Arabic forms أَرْض, جَفْن, قَرْن, but also from the Hebrew forms with the suffix אַרְצִי, etc. Cf. also the pausal forms אָרֶץ, גָּפֶן, קָרֶן. That the *a* in שׁ should be weakened into *ĕ* and even into mere *šewa* (cf. שֶׁהֶם [Eccles. 3:18], corresponding to the Syriac ܫ and the targumic שְׁ) is, therefore, quite in accordance with the law of vowel change in Hebrew.

16. In working out his theory, Sperling lays great stress on the Phoenician אשׁ as constituting the connecting link between שׁ and אשׁר. In this he is followed by König, who makes the summary and categorical statement that the Phoenician form is "in seiner tatsächlichen Existenz ein Bindeglied zwischen hebr. שׁ und אשׁר."[3] Sperling objects to Ewald's view that it failed to give due recognition to this supposed intermediate אשׁ of the Phoenician. To judge from the *Poenulus* of Plautus, this form seems sometimes to have been pronounced in two syllables (*asse*). Such being the case, Sperling argues, one can see no reason for the rejection of the third consonant of Ewald's ground-form אשׁל, least of all in the shape of אשׁר. One

[1] *Lehrgeb.*, II, 323.

[2] Cf. Stade, *Hebräische Grammatik*, p. 130.

[3] *Lehrgeb.*, II, 323.

should expect, says Sperling, to find a trace of this final consonant in Phoenician. Again, if this ר was in reality as fleeting as the Phoenician form אש is supposed to prove, one would at least expect to find a form similar to the Phoenician in some passage of the Hebrew, for it would be singular if אשר, in the course of its history, should have completely passed over the stage of the Phoenician אש.[1]

17. While these remarks expose the weakness of Ewald's theory with reference to the intermediate stage of the supposed development or rather decay of the assumed original אשל, the opposite view put forward by Sperling himself is beset with similar difficulties.[2] In common with Stade, Sperling holds that the Phoenician and the Hebrew ran a common course in their earlier history, and that later on they branched out into two distinct languages. The form אש was already in existence before the separation took place. The Phoenician never developed a fuller form, but the Hebrew completed the process by adding a third pronominal element, ל, thus closing the open syllable in אֲשֶׁ. It is more probable, according to Sperling, that the Hebrew should have made this addition to a form that was growing from ש than that the Phoenician should have cast off the ל of the assumed original אשל. But this theory does not help us in the least. The stubborn fact remains that only *two* forms appear in Hebrew literature with the missing link still to be found. Whether we accept, with Ewald, the theory of decay from אשל to ש, or, with Sperling, that of growth from ש to אשל, in either case we have only the beginning and end of the process with a yawning gulf between. If אש is the immediate precursor of אשל or אשר, we must expect to find some vestige of it in Hebrew. Granting the correctness of this view, the language has preserved examples of the earliest and of the latest form. Why not also of the intermediate form, if such development actually took place? Or are we to suppose that as soon as the Hebrew set out on its independent course of development the אש straightway leaped into an אשל or אשר without revealing a trace of its former existence? Thus it will be seen that Sperling's objection against Ewald's view applies equally to his own. If Ewald's אשל passes into ש without giving due weight to

[1] *Die "nota relationis" im Hebr.*, p. 19.

[2] It must always be borne in mind that Sperling starts with ש as the original form.

אשׁ, Sperling's שֶׁ passes at a bound into (ר)אשׁל, since the אשׁ is absent when the theory is most sorely in need of it.[1]

18. The theory of Sperling is found wanting, finally, also in the last stage of the proposed development. The ר which is added to the אשׁ is not a pronominal element in any Semitic language. Sperling frankly confesses that it "admits of no immediate explanation" ("*eine unmittelbare Erklärung nicht zulässt*").[2] To save the theory, therefore, he is obliged to resort to the expedient of an original ל, thus arriving at the form אשׁל, from which Ewald sets out. In support of this ל, Sperling appeals to the interchange of ל and ר in Semitic, e.g., אֲרוּ and אֲלוּ in biblical Aramaic; מִזָּרוֹת and מַזָּלוֹת in Hebrew. Now we might render any further discussion of this matter unnecessary by simply pointing to the futility of referring to this possible interchange of ל and ר at all, if, as we believe we have shown, the unfinished form אשׁ, to which ל is attached, never existed in Hebrew. But granting, for argument's sake, that the supposed intermediate form אֲשֶׁ actually existed and that the ל was attached to it as a third pronominal element, we again have a right to demand that the latter show some trace of its existence. Strictly speaking, the coexistence, within the same language, of two forms of a word, one with ל, the other with ר, so far from supporting Sperling's view, rather militates against it. It shows plainly that the same word may exist under two forms without the disappearance of the one or the other. Now if there ever had been such a form as אשׁל, we might reasonably expect it to have maintained its existence, even though a by-form אשׁר should have sprung up alongside it. Why not אשׁל and אשׁר as well as אֲלוּ and אֲרוּ? Again, ל being a genuine pronominal element in Semitic, the אשׁל would doubtless have shown considerable tenacity of life.

[1] The Phoenician אשׁ has been variously explained. Kraetzschmar sees in אשׁ nothing but an extension of שׁ by the addition of the demonstrative element א, analogous to the Assyrian a k î for k î. Hommel regards it as a by-form of שׁ due to the transposition (*Umspringen*) of the vowel, analogous to אַם as compared with the Arabic ف; אַל and לא, cf. لَا and Assyrian lâ (cf. *BA*, I, 381). Perhaps it is best, with Delitzsch, to combine the Phoenician אשׁ with the Assyrian a š š u, a š š a, which, though used predominantly as a conjunction, is also employed as a relative, like š a (*Proll.*, p. 44; *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, pp. 151 f.). The fact that a š š u is sometimes accompanied by š a (a š š u š a) is not, as Kraetzschmar thinks, an insuperable objection. Redundancies of this kind are not uncommon; cf. יַעַן וּבְיַעַן in Hebrew.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 20.

Instead of disappearing altogether, it would seem to me, on the contrary, that it would maintain its ground as the predominating form with the possibility of אשר as a by-form. It is not conceivable that this ל should have been so transitory and short-lived that it was driven completely from the field the moment it came into existence. The possible objection that אשל might have flourished in the early pre-literary period and have already yielded its position, when the first written memorials appear, is obviated by the fact that the literature has preserved the still older (according to the theory) ש in spite of later (hypothetical) developments. We repeat, therefore, that we have a right to demand, if the theory is to hold water, that אשל as the nearest ancestor of אשר show some sign of its existence. To sum up, the theory of Sperling necessitates a leap at every stage along the line. Instead of natural growth and sequence from the earliest to the latest form, we have four forms, ש, אש, אשל, and אשר, the two middle ones imaginary and hypothetical, and each of the four disconnected from its neighbor, so far as may be ascertained from the existing records.

c) THE SUBSTANTIVE ORIGIN OF אשר

19. If, therefore, the theory of the pronominal origin of אשר and its etymological kinship with ש must be abandoned, we are compelled to locate the particle among the substantives. This view, together with its principal representatives, has already been mentioned at the beginning of this dissertation. What may be said in its favor?

20. Before looking around for analogies from other languages, let us see if the Hebrew itself lends any countenance to this theory of אשר. I think that an unprejudiced examination of not a few Old Testament passages will show conclusively that the use of אשר differs in some respects so widely and fundamentally from that of any undoubted Semitic demonstrative as to render the view of its nominal origin almost unassailable. I have reference especially to those passages in which אשר *without an antecedent* is employed in the sense of "where" or "whither," as the case may be. Cf. Judg. 5:27, בַּאֲשֶׁר כָּרַע שָׁם נָפַל שָׁדוּד, "*where* he bowed, there he fell down overpowered"; Ruth 1:16, בַּאֲשֶׁר תֵּלִכִי אֵלֵךְ, "*where* thou

lodgest, I will lodge"; vs. 17, בַּאֲשֶׁר תָּמוּתִי אָמוּת, "*where* thou diest, I will die"; Judg. 17:8, 9; I Sam. 23:13; II Kings 8:1; Job 39:30; Exod. 32:34, נְחֵה הָעָם אֶל אֲשֶׁר־דִּבַּרְתִּי לָךְ, "lead this people *whither* I have spoken unto thee"; Ruth 1:16, כִּי אֶל אֲשֶׁר תֵּלְכִי אֵלֵךְ, "for *whither* thou goest I shall go"; II Sam. 15:20, וַאֲנִי הוֹלֵךְ עַל אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי הוֹלֵךְ, "I am going *whither* I am going"; I Kings 8:12, יְהוָה יִשְׁאַךְ עַל אֲשֶׁר לֹא־אֵדָע, "Jahwe shall bear thee *whither* I do not know"; Exod. 5:11, קְחוּ לָכֶם תֶּבֶן מֵאֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָאוּ, "get straw *from where* you can find it."

21. In these passages the substantive origin of אשר seems to be indicated by the construction. This construction is without analogy in other Semitic languages. No Semitic relative used *absolutely* has a local signification such as we find here. König gets around the difficulty by declaring that an antecedent of place is to be supplied in cases like the foregoing, that is, when a preposition is immediately followed by אשר. "Wo also sonst eine Präposition vor einem Relativum steht, bezieht sich dieselbe auf ein vor dem Relativsatz weggelassenes Demonstrativum. Auf einer solchen Ellipse beruht בַּאֲשֶׁר, *ubi;* es ist da hinter אשר nicht noch einmal die vor dem weggelassenen neutralen Demonstrativum stehende Präposition mit dem Personalpronomen gesetzt, also nicht בַּאֲשֶׁר בּוֹ an dem [Punkte], an welchem." This, however, is not an explanation, but an evasion. König here boldly imports into the text the local idea which it is our business to account for in the language as it lies before us. If, as in many other cases, the אֲשֶׁר were preceded by an antecedent of place, the demonstrative theory of the particle could be upheld, so far as these passages are concerned. This will become more apparent presently, when we come to speak of the usage in the other Semitic languages. Baumann, to be sure, who strenuously defends the demonstrative character of אשר, finds no difficulty in dealing with these passages. He says that in such cases אשר has become "mehr ein demonstratives Adverb."[1] In support of this view he points to the fact that there are other instances of the adverbial use of a demonstrative, e.g., Gen. 38:21, לֹא הָיְתָה בָזֶה קְדֵשָׁה, "there is no kedesha here (in this [place])." The use of בָּזֶה in the sense of *hic*, "here," is, of course, quite common. The same

[1] *Hebräische Relativsätze*, p. 22.

applies to מִזֶּה, *hinc*, "from here." But this proves only one thing, viz., that demonstrative pronouns may assume an adverbial function, not, however, that אשר is such a demonstrative. To appeal to this usage of בָּזֶה as supporting the demonstrative origin and use of אשר is simply to beg the question. The fact is that בַּאֲשֶׁר is used only in a *relative* and never in a strictly *demonstrative* sense. בָּזֶה, on the other hand, is never employed in a relative construction.

22. Again, the vague indefiniteness of אשר in some of the passages referred to argues conclusively, it seems to me, against its demonstrative character. While זֶה always points to something definite and near at hand (or at least as present to the speaker's or writer's imagination; cf. II Kings 5:7), never denying its distinctly demonstrative nature, אשר is very often intangibly vague and colorless, similar to "wherever" or "wheresoever," etc. Take the passage Exod. 5:11 quoted above, "get you straw," מֵאֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָאוּ. Here there is no trace of a demonstrative idea, the Pharaoh plainly ndicating that he does not know, and does not care, where the Israelites may obtain the necessary straw for their brickmaking. But what a radical change in the meaning if we were to substitute מִזֶּה for מֵאֲשֶׁר! Yet, according to Baumann's theory, this substitution ought to occasion little or no difference in sense, inasmuch as זֶה and אשר are not only supposed to have the same origin, but it is further contended that אשר never forfeits its demonstrative character, even though employed exclusively in relative constructions.

23. Furthermore, a Semitic demonstrative without any antecedent of place is never employed to express the idea of *motion toward*, *whither*, as is the case with אשר. We have no such combinations as אֶל־זֶה or עַל־זֶה, corresponding to אֶל־אֲשֶׁר and עַל־אֲשֶׁר.

24. Lastly, it will be noticed that in this local use of אשר the adverbial complement (שָׁם, שָׁמָּה, etc.) is easily dispensed with. On this head Baumann says: "Bisweilen kommt es vor, dass das 'Aid mit seiner Präposition ausgelassen wird. Das ist besonders da der Fall, wo die gleiche Präposition bereits vor אשר steht."[1] Among the passages cited by him for sake of illustration is Exod. 5:11, קְחוּ לָכֶם תֶּבֶן מֵאֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָאוּ, which he renders, "Holt euch Häckerling von dort, von wo ihr ihn kriegen könnt." The

[1] *Op. cit.*, pp. 36 f.

repetition of the *von* is doubtless supposed to illustrate the matter in question. But this is not a strictly accurate translation, since the verb מצא is not construed with מִן, but with בְּ or לְ. We see, therefore, that the retrospective with its preposition can be omitted even when the preposition would be *different* from that preceding the אשר. This favors the idea that אשר in itself implies a local signification. An exact rendering of this sentence would be: "Holt euch Häckerling, *von wo* ihr ihn finden könnt," making the entire אשר-clause dependent on מִן.[1]

In view of the foregoing facts, our conclusion is that אשר is not an original demonstrative, but an original noun of place, which in many Old Testament passages has preserved traces of its primitive sense in being employed as a relative adverb of place.

25. This view receives further confirmation from a comparison with other Semitic languages. Speaking of the adverbial use of אשר, Baumann goes on to say: "In ganz analoger Weise wird auch das aramäische Relativum Dan. 2:38 gebraucht: בְּכָל־דִּי דָרִין בְּנֵי אֲנָשָׁא, 'überall da, wo Menschen wohnen.'"[2] But this is by no means strictly "analogous" to the passages we have just considered. Baumann overlooks the fact that the Aramaic דִּי here has an antecedent in בְּכָל, and it is this that contains the local idea, not the following דִּי. Even in English we may render, "in all places [everywhere] *that* men live," instead of "*where* men live." We are now dealing with passages where אשר is employed independently, without an antecedent, and yet plainly has a local signification. To this usage there is absolutely no analogy in biblical Aramaic, as there is none in biblical Hebrew in case of זֶה. It is needless to say that there is no Aramaic בְּדִי as the corresponding equivalent of the Hebrew בַּאֲשֶׁר. There are such expressions as מִן־דִּי, "since"; עַד־דִּי, "until," *donec;* כְּדִי, "when," "as soon as," *simulatque,* as temporal conjunctions, a very easy development from an original demonstrative, but nothing answering to the absolute adverbial use of אשר. In Ezra 6:1 occurs the expression תַּמָּה . . . . דִּי, but only after an antecedent of place, "the house of the archives," so that the use of דִּי with the following adverbial

[1] The question of syntax will receive full discussion later on.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

complement presents no difficulty or irregularity. Here also the local idea is already expressed in the antecedent. A literal English rendering would run as follows: "the house of the archives *that* the treasures were laid up *in*." The דִּי has not lost its demonstrative nature.

26. Passing on to the Syriac, we find that here also the use of the demonstrative relative ܕ offers no parallel to the use of אשר under consideration. It is never used in an adverbial sense without a nominal or adverbial antecedent, which shows that in itself the particle has no local implication. True, the designation of place having preceded, it may often be rendered by "where," "whither," according to our English idiom, but this does not mean that in itself it contains this notion. The difference will be apparent, if we compare the Syriac version with some of the passages referred to above: Ruth 1:16, בַּאֲשֶׁר תָּלִינִי אָלִין—Syr. ܕܐܬܠܝܢ ܕ; Ruth 1:17, בַּאֲשֶׁר תָּמוּתִי אָמוּת—Syr. ܕܢܡܘܬ ܕ; Judg. 17:8, לָגוּר בַּאֲשֶׁר יִמְצָא—Syr. ܕܢܫܟܚ ܕ (cf. also vs. 9); Ruth 1:16, אֶל אֲשֶׁר תֵּלְכִי אֵלֵךְ—Syr. ܠܐܪܚܐ ܕ; II Sam. 15:20, הוֹלֵךְ עַל אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי הוֹלֵךְ—Syr. ܠܐܪܚܐ ; Exod. 5:11, מֵאֲשֶׁר תִּמָּצֵא—Syr. ܡܢ ܕܢܫܬܟܚ ; and so in all passages where the texts agree.

27. The same applies to the Targum. In Judg. 17:8 instead of בַּאֲשֶׁר we have בַּאֲתַר דְּ; Ruth 1:16, אֶל אֲשֶׁר—Targ., לְכָל מַן דְּ; II Sam. 15:20, עַל אֲשֶׁר—Targ., לַאֲתַר דְּ, etc.

28. Even when כָּל־ precedes אשר, it is extremely rare to find the ܕ in Syriac, though it does occur, e.g., Josh. 1:7, בְּכָל־אֲשֶׁר תֵּלֵךְ—Syr. ܒܟܠ ܕܬܗܠܟ (Targ., בְּכָל אֲתַר). This corresponds exactly with בְּכָל דִּי in biblical Aramaic (cf. the Daniel passage discussed above). But the rule is that even here an antecedent of place is substituted; cf. the following passages: I Sam. 14:47, בְּכָל־אשר יִפְנֶה—Syr. ܒܟܠ ܕ (Targ., בְּכָל אֲתַר דְּ); II Sam. 8:14, בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר הָלַךְ—Syr. ܒܟܠ ; Judg. 2:15, בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר יָצְאוּ—Syr. ܒܟܠ ; (Targ., בְּכָל אֲתַר דְּ); II Sam. 7:9, בְּכָל אֲשֶׁר הָלַכְתָּ—Syr. ܒܟܠ ; (Targ., בְּכָל אֲתַר דְּ).

29. The fact that in all these passages there is either a nominal or adverbial antecedent, that the particle ܕ nowhere stands alone,

as is so frequently the case with אשר, shows clearly that the latter must contain a local idea which is absent from the Syriac demonstrative.

30. Coming now to the Arabic, it is well known that the relative الذى is never used as an adverb in any sense. This fact deserves to be well noted, inasmuch as Baumann bases his conclusions as to the character and syntax of אשר largely on the supposed analogy between the Hebrew and the Arabic. But singularly enough this analogy fails completely, as Baumann is obliged to confess, respecting the local adverbial use of אשר. It is also noteworthy that the demonstrative adverbs in Arabic are never employed in the sense of "where" or "whither." Such are هُنا, هاهُنا, هُناكَ, هُنالك, which, according to Reckendorf, are formed on the analogy of the demonstratives ذا, هذا, ذاك, and ذلك,[1] but, true to their demonstrative nature, they never can perform the function of a relative, "where" or "whither" being expressed by حَيْثُ, an original noun. This حَيْثُ, again, is frequently dependent on a preposition, e.g., بِحَيْثُ, "where" (eig. *an wo*[2]); الى حَيْثُ, "to where," "whither" (eig. *nach wo*[2]); مِن حَيْثُ, "from where" (eig. *von wo*[2]). One cannot fail to notice the striking analogy between this mode of expression and the Hebrew בַּאֲשֶׁר, אֶל אֲשֶׁר, מֵאֲשֶׁר. We have here in Arabic the same development that we are vindicating for the Hebrew אשר. Like אשר, the Arabic حَيْثُ also appears without a preposition in the sense of "where" or "whither."

31. Respecting the Assyrian, it is well known that the demonstrative relative ša, when used alone, never has an adverbial meaning. Like the corresponding הַ or ְ, it requires an antecedent of place, e.g., âlu ša ašbu, "the city in which they live," or more literally, "the city *that* they live [in]." The same applies to the Ethiopic ዘ.

32. In consideration of these facts, it must be admitted that אשר in its adverbial use holds a unique place among Semitic relatives. These facts do not receive due recognition by the defenders of the demonstrative theory. To me they justify the conclusion that אשר must have a different origin from that of the demonstrative relatives

[1] *Syntaktische Verhältnisse des Arabischen*, § 150.

[2] Reckendorf, *op. cit.*, § 10.

in other dialects. In the passages referred to above we can still discern the traces of the substantive origin of our particle. But this, of course, is not meant to imply that a sense of its nominal character was still alive in the *Sprachbewusstsein* of the writers. If such had been the case, such combinations as מִקּוֹם אֲשֶׁר, occurring elsewhere, could scarcely have arisen. We should not venture to translate בַּאֲשֶׁר "in the *place* where," as if *place* still retained its substantive force. What we contend is that we have here the petrified remains, as it were, of an earlier stage of the language, when אשר was actually used as and felt to be a noun of place. In the stage represented by the records of the Old Testament, the אשר had already, in these passages, become a relative adverb.

33. If our investigation thus far has made the substantive origin of אשר at least highly probable, this probability is heightened almost into certainty when we compare with אשר the Assyrian a š r u, constr. a š a r. Kraetzschmar, in the article in *Hebraica* referred to above, has collected a number of passages illustrating the use of a š a r:[1] Taylor, IV, 22–24: m u n n a r i b š u n u . . . . a š a r i k a š a d û u r a s s a p u i n a ḫ k a k k e,* "their fugitives they killed with their weapons *where* they overtook them"; Taylor, III, 88 f.: a š a r b i r k â m a n a ḫ t i i š a ṣ i r a b a n š a d î u š i b m a,* "*where* my knees found a resting-place I sat down on the top of the mountain"; *CH*,[2] XXIX, 42: š u m m a z i n n i š t u š i i a š a r e r u b u . . . . m a r ê i t t a l a a d, "if that woman bear children *where* she has entered"; *CH*, XX, 48: a š a r i d d i n u, "*where* they give"; *CH*, XVII, 8, 9: š u m m a a š a r i l l i k u n e m e l a m ḫ a i t a m a r, "if he does not meet with success [there] *whither* he goes"; *VR*, II, 20: T a r ḳ û a š a r i n n a b t u r a š u b a t k a k k ê A š u r i s h u p š u m a,* "the weapons of Ašur overthrew Tirhaka [there] *whither* he had fled"; Asurb. Sm. 125, 61: a š a r t a l l a k î i t t i k i l û l l i k,* "*whither* thou goest, I will go with thee"; Asurb. Sm.: a š a r p a n u k i š a k n û t ê b û k u a n â k u, "I shall go *whither* your face is directed." Examples of this type are very common; further citation is unnecessary.

34. Comparing this use of a š a r with that of אשר in the examples heretofore cited, it will be seen that the only difference is that אשר

[1] *Hebraica*, VI (1890), 296 f. These passages I shall indicate with an asterisk (*).
[2] *Code of Hammurabi*, edition by R. F. Harper.

takes a preposition, while ašar does not. Ruth 1:16, אֶל־אֲשֶׁר תֵּלְכִי אֵלֵךְ, would be exactly the same as ašar tallakî ittiki lûllik but for the preposition אֶל before אֲשֶׁר. This would seem to indicate that אשר has lost its local signification to a greater extent, has become more vague and colorless than ašar. However, I have found several passages in the Amarna Tablets where ašar appears in conjunction with a preposition. Cf. anaku kaḏu ṣabi-ia . . . . ana pani ṣabi beli-ia adi ašar tilaku, "I together with my troops . . . . am at the service of the troops of my lord, wherever they may go."[1] Exactly the same construction occurs in the following letter. The preposition may be omitted (and as a rule is omitted). Cf. ašar tilaku [*sc. the troops*] anaku it[tišunu], "wherever they may go I am with them";[2] anaku kadu . . . . ana pani ṣabî bitati adi ašar jiḳabu šarru beli-ia, "I together with . . . . am at the service of the troops *wherever* the king, my lord, may command" (Winckler: "*wohin* auch befiehlt der König, mein Herr").[3] Ašar is also united with the preposition ina; cf. harrânu ina ašar ašib, "the way to where he dwells."[4] The ina ašar here is equivalent to ina ašri ša used elsewhere, e.g., anaku arduka in ašri ša ibašati, "I am thy servant in the place where I am."[5] It is interesting to note that ina ašri and ina ašar are used in exactly the same constructions; cf. ina ašri anni, "in that place"[6] and ina ašar šanim, "in another place."[7] This shows that the dividing line between the strictly substantive and the hardened (*erstarrt*) adverbial form of ašru was in process of obliteration. That an adverb should connect itself with a preposition is, as is well known, a very common phenomenon. Thus the Arabic حَيْثُ, as already stated, is employed indifferently with or without a preposition. Cf. also in Latin *hinc* and *dehinc; inde* and *deinde;* in English "hence," and "from hence"; "whence" and "from whence," etc. Even to the singular ašar šanim, just referred to, where the changeless adverbial ašar is united with an attribute, I venture to offer a modern parallel in such

[1] *KB*, V, 251, 15 f.
[2] *Op. cit.*, 214, 34.
[3] *Ibid.*, 144, 31.
[4] *Ibid.*, 46, 26.
[5] *Ibid.*, 238, 4 f.
[6] *Ibid.*, 179, 11.
[7] *Ibid.*, 126, 17.

expressions as "everywhere," "nowhere," and others, which exhibit the same tendencies of language.

It is plain from the above that the usage of אשר and ašar agrees more closely than has been generally recognized.

35. We shall now quote some passages in which ašar appears with an antecedent, and, in order to present the Hebrew analogy vividly to the eye, corresponding passages from the Old Testament will be added.

Shal. 69: adi reš (naru) eni ša (naru) Diklat ašar muṣu ša me šaknu alik,* "to the source of the Tigris *where* the springs of water are situated I went"; Hebrew (Num. 20:13): הֵמָּה מֵי מְרִיבָה אֲשֶׁר רָבוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, "these are the waters of Meriba *where*[1] the children of Israel contended." *VR*, VIII, 108 ff.: Maš ašar . . . . iṣṣur šamê la išakan ḳinu* [the land] Maš, "*where* no bird of heaven builds its nest"; Hebrew (Ps. 84:4): גַּם־צִפּוֹר מָצְאָה בַיִת וּדְרוֹר קֵן לָהּ אֲשֶׁר שָׁתָה אֶפְרֹחֶיהָ, "Yea, the sparrow hath found a house and the swallow a nest for herself *where* she may lay her young." And so frequently in the sense of "where" both in Assyrian and in Hebrew. Cf. for the Hebrew Deut. 1:31; 8:15; I Kings 8:9; Isa. 64:10; Ezek. 47:13; Ps. 95:9, and many more passages.

36. Like ašar, אשר is also employed in the sense of "whither." *VR*, X, 13 f.: ultu šade bît markitišu ašar ittanapra-šidu,* "from the mountain, his refuge, *whither* he had fled"; Hebrew (I Kings 12:2; II Chron. 10:2): וְהוּא בְּמִצְרַיִם אֲשֶׁר בָּרַח, "and he was in Egypt, *whither* he had fled."

37. We can trace the affinity between ašar and אשר a step farther. Sometimes the ašar, which in this case has almost lost its local coloring and passed into a relative particle pure and simple, is so indefinite as to take an 'Aid in the form of a noun of place with its respective suffix. Thus, instead of the simple ašar in the sense of "where," there occurs ašar . . . . kirib with the suffix as the exact equivalent of ša . . . . ina libbi. This shows conclusively that ašar was well under way to become a general relative particle, the only reason why it did not reach this stage being, as Kraetzschmar says, the fact that it never ceased to be

[1] Not "because," as the English versions render. Vulg. *ubi jurgati sunt.*

a noun of place. To illustrate: Ina ḫidati erub Bîtriduti ša Sinachê-erba šarrûti êpušu ina libbišu ašar Ašur-ahê-iddina abu banûa kiribšu aldu.[1] In this passage, the ašar . . . . kiribšu has precisely the same meaning as ša . . . . ina libbišu, showing very plainly to what extent the local signification of ašar was fading away. Besides, who can fail to notice in this construction of ašar with the following resumptive kiribšu a striking and unquestionable analogy to the Hebrew אשר with the complementary בְּקִרְבּוֹ ?

38. Winckler, in his edition of the Amarna Letters, holds that in some instances ašar is used interchangeably with ša, even where no local idea is involved; in other words, that ašar has lost its original meaning altogether. It is not necessary to cite all the passages he refers to in the glossary under this head, since they are all of one character. Two will suffice: KAR.KAR pl. ša ḫuraṣu . . . . ašar abi-i-ka ma Mi-im-mu-u-ri-a i-ti-ri-iš, "Bilder aus Gold . . . . habe ich *von* deinem Vater M. verlangt";[2] ḫuraṣu ma-a-at-ta ašar abi-i [ka-i-ti-ri-]iš, "*von* deinem Vater habe ich verlangt viel Gold."[3] The supposed identity between ašar and ša is not brought out by the translation *von*. But Winckler must assume that ašar is here used like ša as the sign of the genitive, viz., "much gold, *that* of thy father." But this view is hardly correct. More commonly the verb erešu, with which the ašar is construed, appears with the preposition ana, e.g., ana aḫi-ia ḫuraṣi ma-a-at-ta e-te-ri-iš, "ich verlangte *von* meinem Bruder viel Gold";[4] mi-ri-iš-ta ma ša ana abi-ka i-ri-šu, "den Wunsch, den ich *an* deinen Vater stellte"[5] (with the *figura etymologica*). The use of ana, as the translation of the last example indicates, shows that the wish or request expressed in erešu is conceived as being addressed *to* or directed *toward* someone (cf. the German, "jemand *an*flehen, *an*gehen," French, "demander *à*" etc.). And since ašar interchanges with ana in connection with this verb, I should assign to it the sense of *to* or *toward*, thus allowing it to retain a local notion. I would add that Winckler's

[1] *Hebraica*, July, 1890.
[2] *KB*, V, 23, 19 f.
[3] *Ibid.*, 21, 50 Rev.
[4] *Ibid.*, 17, 34.
[5] *Ibid.*, 35, 11 f.

view is also rejected by Boehl, though the latter offers no explanation for this singular use of a š a r.[1]

39. The preceding discussion has, it is hoped, made two things clear: first, that אשׁר cannot be classed with the ordinary Semitic relatives, and, secondly, that the Assyrian a š a r quite closely corresponds with it in its adverbial use. Our conclusion, therefore, is that אשׁר not only lost its substantive force by becoming a relative adverb, but developed into a broad and general *nota relationis*, a mere medium of relation,[2] sometimes untranslatable, as we shall see, except by periphrasis.

40. The obvious objection to this is, of course, the singular and isolated position of Hebrew in Semitic as regards the relative, since in the other Semitic dialects a demonstrative performs this function. I recognize the force of this objection. However, the difficulties attending every attempt at locating אשׁר among the demonstratives are insurmountable, etymologically as well as *syntactically*, as we shall see later on. The history of a š r u in Assyrian shows a development in the direction of the Hebrew אשׁר. Why should not this development have been carried a step farther in Hebrew, until אשׁר had worn away into a vague relative particle? Even oriental languages are not absolutely stationary. Development there is in every living language. At all events, rather than have recourse to the wild and baseless etymologies referred to in order to force אשׁר into one mold with Semitic demonstratives, rather, too, than insist on the demonstrative character of אשׁר, while leaving the matter of etymology *in suspenso*,[3] I prefer to believe, for reasons already stated, that in the present instance the Hebrew language pursued an independent course in expressing the relative idea, a course, however, already far under way, though not carried to completion, in the Assyrian. Nevertheless, Gesenius' grammar, following Baumann, says that "אשׁר ist weder als Relativpronomen . . . . noch als blosse *nota relationis*, sondern als ursprüngliches Demonstrativpronomen zu betrachten." And in proof of this statement

[1] *Die Sprache der Amarnabriefe*, § 17.

[2] This designation is not always adequate. The fact that the retrospective complement is often omitted indicates that the particle showed a tendency to assume a more or less definite pronominal function.

[3] Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 138, note 1.

it is added in a note: "Zu dieser Annahme nötigt ebensowohl die analogie des arabischen alladi, welches (wie Hebr. הַלָּזֶה, הַלָּזוּ) deutlich Demonstrativpronomen, wie der Gebrauch von זֶה und זוּ als Relativpronomen."[1] Suppose a grammarian should maintain that, because the original demonstrative "that" is used relatively in English, the relative "who" must also be a demonstrative, or that since the German uses *der*, *die*, *das*, originally demonstratives, as relatives, *welcher*, *welche*, *welches* (or vulgarly *wo*) must also be demonstratives, would it not be a palpably erroneous conclusion? And so it is when we reason from alladi or זה to אשר. The argument is valueless, because it rests on the assumption of the invariable uniformity and immutable fixedness of Semitic grammar. That even a Semitic language may exhibit peculiarities unknown to sister-dialects is seen, for instance, in the *waw* consecutive of the Hebrew and Moabite, of which there is no trace in Assyrian and other languages.

41. Before leaving this part of our discussion, I cannot refrain from calling attention to numerous analogies from other fields. These, while not proving the correctness of our theory of אשר, will, at least, abundantly show that we are not trying to defend an unparalleled grammatical phenomenon. Indeed, it is surprising to note that in various and, in part, widely divergent languages the same tendencies were at work as those underlying the development of אשר, such as we conceive it to have been. Thus we are told that in Chinese the word *sò*, originally a noun of place, is employed as a relative. The Persian کُجَا, "wo des Orts," was originally used like the common relative که.[2] But the nearest approach to the Hebrew אשר, though still more specific, is the *wo* of the provincial dialects of Southern Germany, which in colloquial language is employed almost exclusively as a general relative particle, e.g., "der Mann, *wo*"; "die Frau, *wo*"; "das Kind, *wo*." Like the Hebrew אשר, this *wo* is of course incapable of inflection; and though the *Sprachgefühl* instinctively distinguishes between the nominative and accusative cases (cf. "Der Freund, *wo mich* besuchte," and "der Freund, *wo ich* besuchte"), it serves, as a rule, merely as a connective

[1] Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 138.

[2] Cf. Kraetzschmar, *Hebraica*, July, 1890.

between the principal and subordinate clauses, the precise syntactic relation being indicated by a retrospective in the clause which *wo* introduces; cf. "der Mann, *wo seine* Frau gestorben ist" (Hebr. אֲשֶׁר אִשְׁתּוֹ); "der Mann, *wo* das Haus *ihm* abgebrannt ist" (Hebr. אֲשֶׁר . . . . לוֹ); "der Baum, *wo* ich dir verboten habe *von ihm* zu essen" (Hebr. אֲשֶׁר . . . . מִמֶּנּוּ); "*wo* sein Same *drin* ist" (Hebr. אֲשֶׁר בּוֹ). Even in polite language, the German uses *wo* compounded with a preposition instead of the ordinary relative with its preposition, though with certain restrictions; cf. *worin* for *in welchem, in welcher; wovon* for *von welchem, welcher; womit* for *mit welchem, welcher* (used instrumentally). Very suggestive, too, are the adverbial expressions in German in such phrases as "wo er *hin*gegangen ist," or wo er *her*gekommen ist," which are quite parallel to the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר . . . . שָׁמָּה and אֲשֶׁר . . . . מִשָּׁם. It is true that the Hebrew idiom cannot in all cases be duplicated in German. The German has nothing to correspond with אֲשֶׁר . . . . שָׁם, for the reason that *wo*, though requiring a complement (except as nominative or accusative) when employed as a general relative particle, has so far retained its primary sense, when used as a relative adverb, that it does not admit of a complementary adjunct. The Hebrew כָּל־אֶרֶץ הַחֲוִילָה אֲשֶׁר־שָׁם הַזָּהָב could not be rendered "das ganze Land Havilah, *wo* Gold *dort* ist," in strict correspondence with the Hebrew, but simply "*wo* Gold ist." In other words, the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר is more indefinite than the German *wo*.

42. A similar, though more limited, use of the relative adverb for the relative pronoun is also found in English; cf. "wherein," "whereon," "whereby," "wherewith," etc. And, although at present obsolete, this use of the adverb is found even when the latter refers to a *personal* antecedent; cf. "Edward's seven sons, *whereof* thyself art one" (Shak., *Rich. II*, I, 2).

43. The same phenomenon is observable in French, where the adverb *où* likewise encroaches upon the territory of the relative: "C'est une chose où je te réduirai" (Molière, *L'avare*, Act I, scene iv). *Où* is very often equivalent to *dans, à, sur*, etc., plus a relative pronoun.

44. Also the Latin *ubi* sometimes loses its local meaning entirely and does the duty of a relative, as may be seen from the following

examples: *Huiusmodi mi res semper comminiscere, ubi me excarnifices*, "You are always devising things of this kind, *with which* [*ubi* = *quibus*] to torture me";[1] *neque nobis adhuc praeter te quisquam fuit, ubi nostrum ius contra illos obtineremus;*[2] in this sentence, *ubi* refers to a person and is equivalent to *with whom;*[3] *quia suppeditat nobis ubi et animus ex hoc forensi strepitu reficiatur*, "because he furnishes [that] *with which*," etc.,[4] *ubi* being equivalent to *quo* instrumental.

45. These examples from various languages will suffice to show to what extent a relative adverb of place, forfeiting its local meaning, has tended to assume pronominal functions, or to fade away into what is hardly more than a medium of relation. As remarked, therefore, the development and use of אֲשֶׁר in Hebrew represents but one of many kindred phenomena in the history of language.

B. THE SYNTACTIC RELATION OF אֲשֶׁר

a) CRITICISM OF BAUMANN'S THEORY

46. The substantive origin of אֲשֶׁר is of vital importance in determining the syntactic position of the particle. I trust that the conclusions arrived at with reference to the origin of אֲשֶׁר will receive fuller confirmation in the following pages, in which we shall discuss the syntax. The latter, as I hope to show, substantiates the etymological theory defended in the first part of this treatise. In the nature of the case, the following syntactic discussion will be largely a polemic against the view of Boettcher, Baumann, and (after them) the standard grammar of Gesenius-Kautzsch. Baumann being the chief representative of the demonstrative theory (both as to origin and as to syntax), we may fitly begin by setting forth his views.

47. Baumann firmly and steadfastly maintains that אֲשֶׁר introducing relative clauses belongs logically and syntactically not to the relative clause, but to the principal proposition. There is no subordination, but only co-ordination, no hypotaxis, but only parataxis. If a relative clause has an antecedent, the אֲשֶׁר belongs

[1] Terence *Heautontimoroumenos* 813.

[2] Cicero *Pro P. Quinctio oratio* 34.

[3] Here, perhaps, a trace of local meaning is still discernible.

[4] Cicero *Pro Archia*.

to this antecedent as an appositional demonstrative. "אשר ist weiter nichts, als eine den Attributivsatz einleitende demonstrative Apposition zum Hauptwort."[1] Or: "Das hebräische Relativum ist eine den Relativsatz einleitende demonstrative Apposition zum Beziehungswort und verbindet die folgende Aussage mit demselben als etwas von ihm Auszusagendes."[2] If the relative clause has no antecedent (*selbständiger Relativsatz*), אשר, according to Baumann, is used substantively in the sense of *jener* (*der*), *jene* (*die*), *jenes* (*das*), *solcher* (*der*), etc.,[3] and has no syntactic connection with the relative clause. Syntactically, it belongs to the main sentence, of which it may be subject or object, or it may depend on a preposition, or on a *regens* of a nominal nature, in which case אשר is virtually a genitive.[4] The point that Baumann insists on here is that the substantive use of אשר does not involve the ellipsis of a demonstrative like the absolute use of *qui* for (*is*) *qui*, since אשר is itself a simple demonstrative, and if there is anything to be supplied, it is rather the *relative* according to our notions. As just remarked, אשר in such sentences is equivalent to *is*, *ille* (*qui*), and not (*is*), (*ille*) *qui*.

48. Consistently with this view of the syntactic position of אשר Baumann explains the عائد. In dependent clauses, that is, such as have an antecedent, the retrospective does not point back to אשר, but resumes the antecedent, while in independent clauses, in which אשר is used substantively, the retrospective, of course, must refer to this. The following examples with Baumann's rendering will illustrate the foregoing: Jer. 28:9, הַנָּבִיא אֲשֶׁר שְׁלָחוֹ יהוה, "der Prophet, der, Jahwe hat ihn gesandt"; Num. 17:20, הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר אֶבְחַר־בּוֹ, "der Mann, jener, ich werde ihn erwählen"; Deut. 28:49, גּוֹי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִשְׁמַע לְשֹׁנוֹ, "ein Volk, ein solches, du verstehst seine Sprache nicht."[5] Deut. 27:26, אָרוּר אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יָקִים אֶת־דִּבְרֵי הַתּוֹרָה־הַזֹּאת, "verflucht sei derjenige, welcher den Inhalt dieses Gesetzes nicht in Kraft treten lässt." Here we have the independent use of אשר. Baumann's rendering in this instance, being freer, does not indicate clearly the syntactic relation of

[1] *Relativsätze*. p. 20.
[2] *Ibid.*, p. 30.
[3] *Ibid.*, p. 20.
[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 21 f.
[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 14 f.

אשר. But the comment which he adds makes this sufficiently plain. He says: "Hier könnte man versucht sein, אשר für das grammatische Subjekt des Relativsatzes zu halten, doch auch im vorliegenden Falle gilt: Es steht אשר absolut [i.e., unconnected, detached] an der Spitze der bezüglichen Aussage und hat syntaktisch mit ihr nichts zu tun."[1] Consequently, according to Baumann's mode of rendering, the sentence would run as follows: "Cursed be such a one [אשר]—he does not establish," etc. Gen. 44:10, אֲשֶׁר יִמָּצֵא אִתּוֹ יִהְיֶה־לִּי עָבֶד, "derjenige, bei dem er [*sc.* der Becher] sich findet, soll mein Sklave sein"; precisely, to avoid a possible misconception arising from the use of "whom," the sentence should read: "That one [אשר]—it [*sc.* the cup] shall be found with him—shall be my servant," אשר being clearly detached from the relative clause. Ruth 2:2, אַחַר אֲשֶׁר אֶמְצָא חֵן בְּעֵינָיו, "Hinter demjenigen, in dessen Augen ich Gnade finden werde";[2] literally: "After him, or such a one—I shall find favor in his eyes." Gen. 49:1, אַגִּידָה לָכֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרָא אֶתְכֶם בְּאַחֲרִית הַיָּמִים, literally translated by Baumann thus: "Ich will euch mitteilen jenes (von dem auszusagen ist); es wird euch in der fernsten Zukunft widerfahren."[3] On this passage Baumann remarks: "Da nun אשר durch את als im Accusativ stehend gekennzeichnet ist, so zeigt sich klar, dass es dem Hauptsatzgefüge angehört und von אגידה abhängig ist, d.h. es ist nicht ein Relativum, sondern . . . . ein Demonstrativum."[4] The fact, therefore, that אשר is preceded by the sign of the accusative is supposed to put an end to all controversy. Baumann is so fully convinced of this that he declares on the next page (21) that these passages must serve as a guide in dealing with others in which the syntactic position of אשר is not thus outwardly indicated. As to the validity of this argument, we shall have more to say later on.

49. Another phenomenon to which Baumann attaches very much importance in support of his theory of אשר is the well-known fact that when a relative clause refers to an antecedent in the first or second person the عائد appears almost exclusively in the same person as the antecedent. Examples: Isa. 41:8, ... אַתָּה יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר בְּחַרְתִּיךָ, which Baumann renders, "Du, Israel, das, ich habe

[1] *Relativsätze*, pp. 21 f.
[2] P. 22.
[3] Pp. 20 f.
[4] P. 20.

dich erwählet"; Isa. 51:17, קוּמִי יְרוּשָׁלַיִם אֲשֶׁר שָׁתִית מִיַּד יהוה אֶת־כּוֹס חֲמָתוֹ, "stehe auf, Jerusalem, das aus Jahwes Hand den Becher seines Zornes getrunken hat"; literally this would run, "Stehe auf, Jerusalem, das, du hast getrunken," etc.; Gen. 45:4, אֲנִי יוֹסֵף אֲחִיכֶם אֲשֶׁר־מְכַרְתֶּם אֹתִי, "ich bin Joseph, euer Bruder, jener, ihr habt mich verkauft."[1] The possibility of such constructions, Baumann remarks, reveals the nature and syntactic position of the Hebrew relative.[2]

50. Baumann's theory, it will be seen at a glance, is dominated wholly by his conception of אשר as being not only a demonstrative *originally*, but as *permanently retaining* its demonstrative character in the Hebrew *usus loquendi*. It makes no allowance for a possible weakening of the particle. Nor does it consider the further possibility of syntactic shifting in the structure of a sentence. By which I mean to say that, though we grant the demonstrative origin of אשר, it by no means follows that it *continued* to attach itself appositionally to the antecedent. This point will receive fuller discussion as we proceed.

51. We shall now examine these views more in detail. In his study of the Assyrian relative ša, Kraetzschmar remarks: "ša hat seine ihm anhaftende Demonstrativnatur nie eingebüsst, *es duldet kein weiteres Demonstrativum vor sich.*"[3] While this statement is not quite true as to fact,[4] the argument is sound. It implies that two successive demonstratives cannot belong to the same noun. What Kraetzschmar says of ša, Gesenius-Kautzsch says of אֲשֶׁר. Having asserted the demonstrative character of אשר, the grammar proceeds to say: "Als solches [i.e., as a demonstrative] zeigt es sich in *unmittelbarer* Anlehnung an den näher zu bestimmenden Substantivbegriff."[5] Now (assuming Kraetzschmar's statement to be correct) if the fact that the Assyrian ša does not tolerate another demonstrative before it clearly proves that it never lost its demonstrative character, the equally patent fact that אֲשֶׁר *does*, in numerous cases, tolerate an immediately preceding demonstrative proves

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 27. [2] *Ibid.*, p. 29.

[3] *BA*, I, 399. Italics ours.

[4] Cf. *Ashurb.*, II, 101, šuttu annitu ša emuru, "that dream which he saw"

[5] § 138.

with equal clearness that it cannot be a demonstrative, or, at least (granting it to have been a demonstrative *originally*), that it has lost its demonstrative nature. The fact is that neither Baumann nor Gesenius-Kautzsch has paid any attention to that large class of passages in which a nominal antecedent is followed first by a demonstrative, which in its turn is followed by אֲשֶׁר. Thus according to the theory that we are opposing we should indeed have the impossible phenomenon of *two successive demonstratives* belonging to the same noun. The demonstratives occurring in this way are הַזֶּה, הַזֹּאת, הָאֵלֶּה, הָהוּא, and הַלָּז; cf. Gen. 28:20, בַּדֶּרֶךְ הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי הוֹלֵךְ, "in this way that I am about to go"; Gen. 33:8, כָּל־הַמַּחֲנֶה הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר פָּגַשְׁתִּי, "all this company which I met"; cf. also Gen. 37:6, 10, 22; 44:15; Exod. 13:3; 18:14, 18; 32:13; 33:17; Josh. 2:17; 14:12; 22:16; I Sam. 12:16; 24:20; 26:16; II Sam. 12:21; I Kings 6:12; 8:27, 43; 9:3; 12:9, 10; II Kings 18:19; Isa. 28:14; 36:4; 38:7; Jer. 7:10, 11; 25:13; 32:22, 36, 43; 33:10; Amos 3:1; 5:1; Neh. 2:19; 13:17; I Chron. 29:16; II Chron. 6:18, 33; 7:21; 10:9 (forty-four instances in all). Similarly, אֲשֶׁר follows הַזֹּאת; cf. Gen. 28:22, וְהָאֶבֶן הַזֹּאת אֲשֶׁר שַׂמְתִּי, "and this stone which I have set up"; cf., further, Num. 14:27; Deut. 4:8; 11:22; 15:6; 30:4; Josh. 23:13, 15; Judg. 20:12; I Sam. 25:27; I Kings 14:15; II Kings 23:27; Jer. 11:8; 13:10; 44:4; Ezek. 3:3; II Chron. 6:34 (seventeen instances in all). So also with הָאֵלֶּה; cf. Gen. 21:29, שֶׁבַע כְּבָשֹׂת הָאֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר הִצַּבְתָּ לְבַדָּנָה, "these seven ewe lambs which thou hast set by themselves"; cf., further, Num. 1:17; 15:22; 34:29; Deut. 6:6; 10:21; 12:28; 18:14; 20:16; 27:4; Josh. 4:20; 21:19; I Sam. 2:22; I Kings 7:45; 9:13; II Kings 23:17; Jer. 38:16, 27; 43:10; Zech. 8:17 (perhaps doubtful); Neh. 6:8; II Chron. 32:14 (twenty-two instances in all). Passages with הָהוּא; cf. Num. 10:32, וְהָיָה הַטּוֹב הַהוּא אֲשֶׁר יֵיטִיב יהוה עִמָּנוּ, "and it shall be that the good which Jahwe shall show us"; cf., further, Deut. 1:19; 17:5, 10; I Kings 8:27, 43; 22:25; II Chron. 9:9 (eight instances in all). Finally, there is one passage in which אֲשֶׁר is preceded by הַלָּז; cf. II Kings 23:17, מָה הַצִּיּוּן הַלָּז אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי רֹאֶה, "what is that monument which I see?"

52. None of these passages (ninety-two in all) has, as already remarked, been considered by Baumann or Gesenius-Kautzsch. Baumann incidentally cites two of the passages, but merely as illustrating the absence of the retrospective. I shall insert one with Baumann's translation: II Kings 18:19, מָה הַבִּטָּחוֹן הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר בָּטָחְתָּ, "was bedeutet diese Zuversicht, die du hegst?" This rendering is, of course, correct; but it is obtained by ignoring the *supposedly* demonstrative force of אֲשֶׁר. It would be interesting if Baumann had in this case also given a literal translation, such as his theory demands. It would necessarily run as follows: "Was ist *diese* (הַזֶּה) Zuversicht, *diese* (אֲשֶׁר)—du hegst (sie)?" Or still more complete: "Was ist *diese* Zuversicht, *diese* (von der auszusagen ist): du hegst (sie)." It is needless to say that such syntax is impossible. All these passages plainly show that אֲשֶׁר is not a demonstrative but that it is little more than the equivalent of Baumann's parenthetical remark, "von der (dem, denen) auszusagen ist," that is to say, אֲשֶׁר is a mere connective[1] indicating that something more is to be said about the antecedent. I should like to call particular attention to the last passage cited in the foregoing paragraph: מָה הַצִּיּוּן הַלָּז אֲשֶׁר. This הַלָּז is the Hebrew counterpart of the Arabic الذى. Are we to suppose that אֲשֶׁר is, in effect, another الذى also belonging to הַצִּיּוּן?

53. All these passages show clearly that אֲשֶׁר does not belong to the "Rektionsgefüge des Hauptsatzes." And it is these passages that must guide us in the investigation of the syntax of אֲשֶׁר. If in the sentence הִקְדַּשְׁתִּי אֶת־הַבַּיִת הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר בָּנִיתָה (I Kings 3:9) the particle אֲשֶׁר cannot belong to הַבַּיִת, it cannot, of course, be consistently maintained that it does in the following sentence, אֶת־הַבַּיִת אֲשֶׁר הִקְדַּשְׁתִּי (I Kings 9:7), that is, in such sentences as Baumann selects as the basis of his conclusions.

54. To this use of אֲשֶׁר that of זֶה or זוּ offers no parallel. To be sure, Baumann remarks: "זֶה und זוּ leiten selbständige und unselbständige Relativsätze ein. Von ihrer syntaktischen Stellung gilt das von אֲשֶׁר Gesagte."[2] This is again adopted by Gesenius-Kautzsch. But this statement requires modification. זה (זו),

[1] Cf. § 39, note.

[2] *Op. cit.*, p. 47.

being a demonstrative, is never preceded by another demonstrative; cf. Exod. 13:8; Isa. 25:9; Ps. 74:2; 78:54; 104:8, 26; Prov. 23:22; Job. 15:17; 19:19. Baumann further remarks that זֶה or זוּ is sometimes joined by the *linea makkef* with the antecedent, showing that it is not a relative in the ordinary sense. But apart from the fact that this is not always the case (cf. Ps. 104:26, לִוְיָתָן זֶה־יָצַרְתָּ), the same argument, applied to אֲשֶׁר, will lead to the opposite conclusion, since אֲשֶׁר is in most cases united by *makkef* with the *following* clause, not with the antecedent. Like זֶה, the Aramaic דִּי is also sometimes found united by *makkef* with what follows; cf. Ezra 5:4, שְׁמָהַתָּ גֻּבְרַיָּה דִּי־דְנָה בִּנְיָנָה בָּנַיִן, "the names of the men that were building this building."

55. In Aramaic, the relative particle is sometimes preceded by a demonstrative with a nominal antecedent; cf. Ezra 6:12, בֵּית־אֱלָהָא דֵּךְ דִּי בִירוּשְׁלֵם, "this house of God which is in Jerusalem." But this, of course, does not mean that דִּי was felt to belong to the antecedent, but clearly shows that the original demonstrative had worn away to a mere medium of relation, a *nota relationis;* cf. also Dan. 3:22, 27; 6:25; Ezra 5:17.

56. The same applies to the Syriac ܕ which in many cases has clearly passed into the regimen of the subordinate clause, even to the extent of being preceded by a preposition.[1]

57. As for the Arabic, the remarks of Baumann are, in the main, correct. It is well known that الدى is a demonstrative belonging syntactically to the antecedent. This is seen from the fact that it ordinarily agrees with the latter not only in gender and number but even in case. It is also true that the antecedent may have a demonstrative. This, however, never interposes itself between الدى and the antecedent. In other words, الدى follows immediately upon the antecedent. It is not found, as is so frequently the case with אֲשֶׁר, in direct juxtaposition with another demonstrative accompanying the antecedent. To illustrate, we may compare the following examples from the Arabic and the Hebrew: مَن هدا الحىّ الدى تعنى, "*wer* ist dieser Stamm, den du meinst?"[2] and מָה

[1] Cf. Nöldeke, *Syrische Gr.*, § 349. It is not necessary to assume with Nöldeke that this is due to Greek influence.

[2] Reckendorf, *Syntaktische Verhältnisse des Arabischen*, p. 618.

הַחֲלוֹם הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר, "*what is* this dream which thou hast dreamed?" Besides, Reckendorf sees in Arabic sentences of the above type a tendency on the part of الذى to sever its close connection with the antecedent and enter into the construction of the relative clause. He says: "Nun vollzog sich aber eine Verschiebung in dem Verhältnis des Relativpronomens zum Relativsatz, indem das Relativpronomen in vielen Fällen seine Freiheit gegenüber dem Relativsatze verlor und auch hinsichtlich seiner Kasuskonstruktion (wenn auch nicht seiner Kasus*form*) in den Satzverband des Relativsatzes einrückte."[1] Similarly Brockelmann: "Aber die Tendenz, die in allen semitischen Sprachen wirksam gewesen, das Pronomen enger an den Nebensatz anzuschliessen, hat vereinzelt schon im Altarabischen dazu geführt, dass die Form allaḏi erstarrt und auch bei pluralischem Leitwort verwandt wird, wie lastuma 'ulā'ika 'llaḏi 'anaitu, seid ihr nicht die, die ich meinte?"[2] Note here the word *erstarrt*, which is seen clearly from the fact that the relative الذى is employed in the singular, although the antecedent is in the plural. This being true of the Arabic relative, notwithstanding its demonstrative origin and its immediate proximity to the nominal antecedent, what must be said of the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר, separated at it is from the antecedent by an intervening demonstrative?

58. I shall now proceed to the consideration of those passages in which אֲשֶׁר follows a demonstrative standing alone, i.e., not as the accompaniment of a nominal antecedent. These passages are again not treated by Baumann and others. Gen. 6:15, וְזֶה אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה אֹתָהּ, "this [*it is*] that thou shalt build"; Gen. 44:5, הֲלֹא זֶה אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁתֶּה . . . . בּוֹ, "is this not [*that*] which my lord drinks with?" Exod. 29:38, וְזֶה אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, "and this is [*that*] which thou shalt do concerning the altar"; Deut. 14:12, וְזֶה אֲשֶׁר לֹא תֹאכְלוּ מֵהֶם, "and this is [*that*] which you shall not eat of." What Baumann's treatment of these examples would be is clear from what he says on II Sam. 2:4, אַנְשֵׁי יָבֵשׁ גִּלְעָד אֲשֶׁר קָבְרוּ אֶת־שָׁאוּל, "die Leute von Gilead was es [*diejenigen*], die Saul

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 617.

[2] *Vergleichende Gr.*, II, 565.

begruben."[1] That is to say, אֲשֶׁר is a predicate nominative pure and simple. It is equivalent to *ii*, not *qui*. If I were to adopt the suggestion of Driver (*Notes on Samuel*) that the אֲשֶׁר has somehow got into an unnatural position, that would end the matter, so far as this passage is concerned. But the fact that this type of construction is by no means isolated or anomalous obliges us to take the text as it stands. So far from being "an unnaturally worded sentence" (Driver), it will be seen that it falls in line with the sentences that we are now considering. The only legitimate rendering is "The men of Jabesh Gilead are [*those*] who have buried Saul," the entire אשר-*clause*, being the predicate. So also in the foregoing sentences. The demonstrative זֶה (note the accent) is *virtually* a sentence: "This is [*that*]." According to the Hebrew idiom it is simply the subject of which the following אֲשֶׁר-clause forms the predicate. This analysis is required not only in the light of what has already been said, but receives additional support from the fact that in not a few cases an actual demonstrative used as the predicate nominative is found as the antecedent of אֲשֶׁר in sentences of this kind. Cf. Esther 7:5, וְאֵי־זֶה הוּא אֲשֶׁר מְלָאוֹ לִבּוֹ, "who is he (הוּא) whose heart has moved him?"; Ezek. 38:17, אַתָּה הוּא אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתִּי, "thou art he of whom I spake"; I Chron. 21:17, אֲנִי הוּא אֲשֶׁר חָטָאתִי, "I am he that has sinned." If it be maintained that הוּא in such cases is not really a predicate nominative, but merely an attendant of the subject for the sake of greater emphasis, this is incorrect, as may be seen from other passages; cf. Ps. 102:28, וְאַתָּה הוּא, "Thou art he," i.e., the *same* (in opposition to the transitoriness of all things spoken of before); Isa. 41:4, אֲנִי הוּא, "I am he"; 43:10, 13.[2] Similarly מִי הוּא, זֶה הוּא, אֵלֶּה הֵם.[3]

59. The same construction is found with אֵלֶּה; cf. Num. 34:29, אֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יהוה לְנַחֵל, "these are [*they*] whom Jahwe commanded"; Josh. 13:32, אֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר נָחַל מֹשֶׁה, "these are [*they, sc.* the inheritances] which Moses allotted"; "Das ist's, was Moses verteilte" (Steuernagel); Josh. 14:1, וְאֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר נָחֲלוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל,

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 22.

[2] Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, § 200.

[3] *Ibid.*, § 201.

"this is [*that*] which the Israelites received as an inheritance"; Zech. 1:10, אֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר שָׁלַח יהוה, "these are [*they*] whom Jahwe has sent."

60. In like manner, אֲשֶׁר follows הוּא; cf. Gen. 42:14, הוּא אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתִּי, "this is [*that*] which I have said";[1] Lev. 10:3, הוּא אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יהוה, "this is [*that*] which Jahwe said"; I Kings 18:22, הֲלֹא הוּא אֲשֶׁר הֵסִיר חִזְקִיָּהוּ אֶת־בָּמֹתָיו, "is this not he whose high-places Hezekiah removed?"

61. אֲשֶׁר also occurs after זֹאת; cf. Num. 8:24, זֹאת אֲשֶׁר לַלְוִיִּם, rendered by Baentsch, "Das ist's, was mit Bezug auf die Leviten (geschehen soll)." The LXX favors the Massoretic text: *τοῦτό ἐστι τὸ περὶ τῶν Λευ.* Gen. 49:28, וְזֹאת אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר לָהֶם אֲבִיהֶם, "and this is it that their father spake unto them" (R.V.).

b) SUBSTANTIVE RELATIVE CLAUSES

1. *Substantive Relative Clauses as Subject*

62. Entering now into a fuller discussion of the substantive or independent relative clauses, I must repeat, in the first place, that Baumann's conclusions are based on only part of the facts. He selects such passages as seem to suit his theory, while numerous others, inimical to it, are passed by unnoticed. To begin with the clauses used as the subject, I shall insert here a typical example from Gesenius-Kautzsch which will illustrate the mode of treatment: Num. 22:6, אֲשֶׁר תָּאֹר יוֹאָר, is dissected thus: "der—du verfluchst [ihn]—ist verflucht," אֲשֶׁר being the subject of יוֹאָר. This after Baumann, who cites Deut. 27:26, אָרוּר אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָקִים אֶת־דִּבְרֵי, with the remark that אֲשֶׁר has nothing to do syntactically with the attributive clause, i.e., it is the subject of אָרוּר. "Cursed is he—[*he*] does not fulfil the words," etc.

63. To show the incorrectness of this syntactic scheme nothing further is necessary than to call attention to such passages as preclude the possibility of its application; cf. Zech. 14:17, וְהָיָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעֲלֶה . . . . וְלֹא עֲלֵיהֶם יִהְיֶה הַגֶּשֶׁם. There is more than one reason why this sentence cannot be analyzed after the Boettcher-Baumann-Gesenius-Kautzsch fashion. Keeping the difficulty offered by the *waw consecutive* in abeyance for the present, can

[1] Gunkel and others favor the insertion of הַדָּבָר after הוּא (cf. Gen. 41:28), but this is unnecessary, as may be seen from the other passages quoted above.

the relative clause be regarded here as in any possible way *parenthetical*,[1] so to speak? Let us apply the above scheme. "And it shall be, *that one*—[he] does not go up—upon *them* shall be no rain." Assuming for the present that אֲשֶׁר can be a *casus pendens* anticipating עֲלֵיהֶם, the great difficulty of the number of the verb in the relative clause remains unsolved. How account for the singular יַעֲלֶה? There would be a semblance of possibility for the construction we are opposing, if instead of יַעֲלֶה we should have the plural יַעֲלוּ. We might then construe: "*They* [אֲשֶׁר]—[*they*] do not go up [יַעֲלוּ]—upon *them* shall be no rain." The fact, however, that the verb in the relative clause is in the singular shows conclusively that its number is determined by אֲשֶׁר. Consequently, the אֲשֶׁר belongs syntactically to the relative clause. The plural עֲלֵיהֶם in the main clause is, of course, easily accounted for. The relative clause is general and indefinite, involving a plural idea. The only possible rendering of the verse is: "whoever does not go up, upon them shall be no rain." Another passage in which it is equally impossible to construe אֲשֶׁר with the main clause is Isa. 55:1, אֲשֶׁר אֵין לוֹ כֶּסֶף לְכוּ. If אֲשֶׁר is to be construed with the main clause here, it must be equivalent to the second person plural of the personal pronoun! Further, if אֲשֶׁר be a plural, how account for the singular לוֹ? The לוֹ becomes inexplicable if detached from אֲשֶׁר. They both belong together, and the verse must be rendered: "whoever has no money—come."

64. The importance of the *waw consecutive* has already been alluded to. To the first passage quoted in the last paragraph we may here add a few more typical instances: Gen. 44:9, אֲשֶׁר יִמָּצֵא . . . . אִתּוֹ וָמֵת; Judg. 1:12, אֲשֶׁר יַכֶּה . . . . וְנָתַתִּי לוֹ; Mic. 3:5, אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִתֵּן . . . . וְקִדְּשׁוּ. The first of these passages is cited twice by Gesenius-Kautzsch. In § 112 *ii*, the verse is translated: "*derjenige*, bei dem der Becher gefunden werden wird . . . . der soll sterben." In § 138 *f* we find the following: "*der*—gefunden wird er [der Becher] bei ihm—muss sterben." One cannot fail to notice that in this last rendering the *waw* is completely ignored, while in the former its force is indicated by the resumptive *der*. Reference, however, is made to § 143 *d*, where attention is drawn to the *waw*

[1] This expression is employed by Boettcher.

apodosis after a *casus pendens*. Accordingly, אֲשֶׁר is to be regarded as a *casus pendens*. Now, there are, of course, numerous instances in which the *waw* follows upon a single word; cf. Jer. 6:19, וְתוֹרָתִי וַיִּמְאָסוּ־בָהּ, "and as for my law, they have despised it"; Gen. 17:14, ... וְנִכְרְתָה . . . . וְעָרֵל זָכָר, "ein Unbeschnittener aber . . . . (falls ein solcher betroffen wird), so soll er ausgerottet werden," etc.;[1] Gen. 22:24, וַתֵּלֶד . . . . וּפִילַגְשׁוֹ, "und (was) sein Kebsweib . . . . (betrifft), so gebar sie."[2] With reference to this usage the grammar says that the *casus pendens* is virtually a sentence (*Satzäquivalent*, 112 *ff*, 111 *h*). Hence the above mode of translation ("was . . . . betrifft, so"). Why call a *casus pendens* a "sentence-equivalent?" Obviously, to explain the use of the following *waw*. This is, perhaps, putting an unnecessarily heavy burden upon the *casus pendens*. It was hardly felt to be a *Satzäquivalent;* but so much is true that this *casus absolutus* must be sufficiently definite and suggestive to arrest the attention momentarily and to warrant, as it were, a fresh start (at the *waw*) in the continuation and completion of the thought. Such a word as this, אֲשֶׁר, as employed in indefinite relative clauses, in the nature of the case cannot be. We can easily test this. Let us come back once more to Gen. 44:9, ... אֲשֶׁר יִמָּצֵא וָמוֹת, and isolate אֲשֶׁר as a *casus pendens*. According to Gesenius-Kautzsch, the following paraphrastic rendering should be allowable: "Was den betrifft—der Becher wird bei ihm gefunden werden—so soll er sterben." We at once feel that this will not work, for the reason that *was den betrifft* lacks content and distinctness. But the matter assumes an entirely different complexion as soon as we say, "was den betrifft, bei dem der Becher gefunden werden wird, so soll er sterben." In other words, the explanation and justification of the *waw* in sentences of this kind is to be sought in the *content of the entire relative clause*, not in the particle as a supposed *casus pendens*. An ocular representation of the syntax must employ only *one*—and not *two* ("With whomsoever the cup be found—he shall die"; "Whoever shall smite—unto him will I give," etc.). The *waw* marks the division, and may sometimes be rendered by "then." This applies especially to indefinite relative clauses, which are virtually conditional. Thus

[1] Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 112 *mm*. [2] § 111 *h*.

Mic. 3:5 might be freely rendered: "If anyone does not put into their mouth, *then* they consecrate war against him." Whatever precedes the *waw* constitutes a logical and grammatical unit.

65. Instead of the *waw*, a special resumptive pronoun is quite frequently employed to introduce the main clause. The principle involved is the same as with the *waw*, only that the use of the pronoun gives greater emphasis to the principal sentence; cf. Exod. 12:16, אַךְ אֲשֶׁר יֵאָכֵל לְכָל־נֶפֶשׁ הוּא יֵעָשֶׂה לָכֶם. Here again the demonstrative theory presupposes that אֲשֶׁר is a *casus pendens*, which, being resumed by הוּא, is really the subject of יֵעָשֶׂה. According to the theory we should have to analyze as follows: "Only that (אֲשֶׁר has no connection with יֵאָכֵל)—[*it*] shall be eaten by every one—that shall be prepared." These *disjecta membra* require no further comment. The simple fact is that אֲשֶׁר is the subject of יֵאָכֵל, and the entire אֲשֶׁר-clause, emphatically resumed by הוּא, is the subject of יֵעָשֶׂה. "Only what is eaten by every one, *that* shall be prepared." Cf. in English, "Who noble ends by noble means obtains, *that* man is great indeed" (Pope, *Essay on Man*). A similar passage is Gen. 15:4, כִּי־אִם אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִמֵּעֶיךָ הוּא יִירָשֶׁךָ, "but one that shall come forth out of thy bowels, *he* shall be thine heir." Not: "But that one—[*he*] shall come forth, etc.—*he* shall be thine heir." Note also the accent.

2. *Substantive Relative Clauses as Object*

66. We shall now pass on to consider the relative substantive clause used as the object. It is in the objective relative clauses that Baumann would find one of the main stays for his theory of the syntax of our particle. As a typical passage, he singles out Gen. 49:1, as already remarked. The presence of the accusative sign את before אֲשֶׁר (אַגִּידָה לָכֶם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־) is to him an unassailable proof that אֲשֶׁר itself must be in the accusative, and that it must belong to the *Hauptsatzgefüge* as the object of אַגִּידָה. Before offering criticism, it may be well to transcribe a few more of Baumann's passages, all of which are to be analyzed in the same way as Gen. 49:1. Deut. 5:11, כִּי לֹא יְנַקֶּה יהוה אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יִשָּׂא אֶת־שְׁמוֹ לַשָּׁוְא, "denn Jahwe lässt den nicht ungestraft, der seinen

namen freventlich ausspricht"; Deut. 21:16, בְּיוֹם הַנְחִילוֹ אֶת־בָּנָיו אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יִהְיֶה לוֹ, "am Tage, wo er seinen Söhnen das übergiebt, was er besitzt"; Lev. 13:57, בָּאֵשׁ תִּשְׂרֹפֶנּוּ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ הַנָּגַע, "Mit Feuer soll man es vertilgen, das, woran sich der Aussatz befindet." Baumann's rendering in these cases is freer, so that the syntactic relation of אשר is not indicated in the German translation. However, these passages are in Baumann's opinion so manifestly in favor of his theory that he says, "Von diesen Fällen hat man auszugehen und nach ihnen diejenigen zu beurteilen, wo die Sprache die syntaktische Stellung des אשר nicht zum Ausdruck bringt."[1]

67. Baumann is determined at all costs to keep the אֲשֶׁר from slipping away from the main clause, and consequently he seizes upon the preceding את to prove that it is the object of the principal verb and wholly disconnected with the subordinate clause. But this mode of reasoning will not hold water. It is a mere begging of the question. It does not *prove* that אשר must be a demonstrative in the accusative case, but merely shows that, the demonstrative theory *assumed*, the accusative sign dovetails in with this theory. A stringent proof would have to show that the prefixed את is inexplicable on any other than the demonstrative conception of אשר. As a matter of fact, however, the accusative sign admits of a very easy explanation without adopting the proposed analysis. Its function is not to subordinate the אֲשֶׁר, but the *entire clause* introduced by אשר. Nor need this surprise us. Such a construction is quite in harmony with Hebrew usage in general, which often treats an entire clause, grammatically, as a single word. One need only recall the very common construction of an entire sentence depending (as a single idea) on a noun in the construct, to which we shall have occasion to recur later on. Even granting, therefore, that אשר were an original demonstrative, the את would not prove that it belonged to the principal sentence; and, of course, the argument fails completely in view of the vague and indeterminate character of our particle. Moreover, in all the passages cited by Baumann, one cannot fail to notice that the accentuation stands directly opposed to his syntax, the אֲשֶׁר being in every instance joined with the *following* statement by means of the *makkef*. In the opinion of the

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 21.

punctuators, the accusative sign את was, therefore, prefixed not to אשר but to the entire succeeding clause. And so it is with scores of other passages which I have examined. Again, there are passages in which Baumann's syntactic scheme will not fit into the text so snugly as it apparently does in the passages selected by him for illustration. In perfectly regular constructions, such as we find in Gen. 49:1 and numerous other places, it might be contended that, keeping other objections in abeyance, the אֶת־אֲשֶׁר constitutes the object of the principal verb. But where there is no such regularity of construction, the scheme will not fit. In Num. 32:31 we read the following: אֵת אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יהוה אֶל־עֲבָדֶיךָ כֵּן נַעֲשֶׂה. Here the resumptive כֵּן is troublesome for the Baumann analysis. If this כֵּן were absent, it might be contended that אֵת אֲשֶׁר is the object of נַעֲשֶׂה ("*that*—Jahwe has commanded thy servants—we shall do"); but the insertion of כֵּן between the two members of the sentence makes this analysis impossible. What does this כֵּן resume? Not, of course, אֵת אֲשֶׁר alone, which as a *substantive* idea (according to the theory) could not tolerate an *adverbial* resumptive. The כֵּן gathers up and resumes the logical content of the entire preceding clause, which contains an abstract *verbal* idea.[1] The force of the objection urged here will become more apparent if we contrast with the verse just quoted a similar one containing an emphatic resumptive pointing back to a *nominal* idea: Judg. 11:24, הֲלֹא אֵת אֲשֶׁר יוֹרִישְׁךָ כְּמוֹשׁ אֱלֹהֶיךָ אוֹתוֹ תִּירָשׁ, "what thy god Chemosh giveth thee to possess, *that* wilt thou not possess?" Cf. also Num. 23:12.

68. Even this latter type of sentence is not treated by Baumann. What has been said above with reference to the emphatic resumptive in connection with relative clauses used as subject will also apply here. Judg. 11:24 is not to be analyzed thus: "That—Chemosh, thy god will give thee to possess [*it*]—that wilt thou not possess?" The אֵת אֲשֶׁר is not a *casus pendens*.

69. We shall now insert a few of the numberless instances of the objective relative clause without the accusative sign. Gen. 41:28, אֲשֶׁר אֱלֹהִים עֹשֶׂה הִרְאָה אֶת־פַּרְעֹה, "What God is about to do he has shown Pharaoh"; not: "That—God is about to do [*it*]—he

[1] R.V. *As . . . . so*, and Kautzsch *wie . . . . so*.

has shown Pharaoh," אשר being the object of עשה, not of הראה; Exod. 4:12, וְהוֹרֵיתִיךָ אֲשֶׁר תְּדַבֵּר, "I will teach thee what thou shalt speak"; Exod. 6:1, עַתָּה תִּרְאֶה אֲשֶׁר אֶעֱשֶׂה לְפַרְעֹה, "Now shalt thou see what I will do unto Pharaoh"; I Sam. 10:7, עֲשֵׂה לְךָ אֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָא יָדֶךָ, "Do for thyself what thy hand shall find," i.e., do as occasion shall serve thee (R.V.); II Sam. 18:4, אֲשֶׁר־יִטַב בְּעֵינֵיכֶם אֶעֱשֶׂה, "What is good in your eyes I shall do" (think of making אֲשֶׁר the object of אֶעֱשֶׂה in spite of *Makkef* and accentuation!); Isa. 33:13, שִׁמְעוּ רְחוֹקִים אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי, "Hear, ye that are afar off, what I have done"; Isa. 37:11, שָׁמַעְתָּ אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ מַלְכֵי אַשּׁוּר, "thou hast heard what the kings of Assyria have done"; Isa. 44:7, וְאֲשֶׁר תָּבֹאנָה יַגִּידוּ לָמוֹ, "and what shall come let them announce." In all of these cases—and they might be greatly multiplied—the accentuation is again directly opposed to the syntactic scheme defended by Baumann.

3. *Substantive Relative Clauses Depending on a Preposition*

70. It is a well-known phenomenon in Hebrew that a preposition may govern an entire clause just as well as a single word. When, therefore, a relative clause introduced by אשר depends on a preposition, the latter subordinates the clause, not merely the particle, to which the former is supposed to stand in an appositional relation. This analysis is required by the vague non-demonstrative character of אשר. Such sentences as וַיֹּאמֶר לַאֲשֶׁר עַל־בֵּיתוֹ are not to be analyzed, "and he said to him [אשר]—[*he*] was over his house"; but rather, "And he said to [*him*] who-was-over-his-house," the entire clause being conceived as a single idea, while the relative is hardly more than a medium of relation. Constructions of this kind are very common; cf. the following passages: Gen. 27:8, שְׁמַע בְּקֹלִי לַאֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי מְצַוֶּה אֹתָךְ, "Obey my voice in what I am about to command thee"; Gen. 47:6, "If there are able men among them [וְשַׂמְתָּם שָׂרֵי מִקְנֶה עַל־אֲשֶׁר־לִי], set them as rulers of the cattle over my property"; Gen. 47:24, "And it shall come to pass at the harvest that you shall give a fifth unto Pharaoh and four parts shall be your own, for seed of the field . . . . [וְלַאֲשֶׁר בְּבָתֵּיכֶם] and for your

households" (not "for those—[*they*] are in your houses"); Exod. 16:16, "This is the thing which Jahwe has commanded, Gather ye . . . . [אִישׁ לַאֲשֶׁר בְּאָהֳלוֹ], every man for [*those*] who are in his tent"; Exod. 29:27, "Thou shalt sanctify the breast of the wave-offering . . . . of the ram of consecration [מֵאֲשֶׁר לְאַהֲרֹן] of what belongs to Aaron"; Lev. 27:24, "In the year of jubilee the field shall return [לַאֲשֶׁר קָנָהוּ מֵאִתּוֹ] to him from whom he bought it" (lit. "to from-whom-he-bought-it"). Here the אשר is nothing more than a connecting link. There are numerous other passages of the same kind which it is needless to quote. I shall merely indicate where they may be found: Lev. 5:24; 14:30; Num. 5:7; 6:11; 20:24; Josh. 10:11; 17:16; Judg. 21:5; I Sam. 30:14; II Sam. 18:8; II Kings 10:22; Isa. 2:8; 29:12; 31:6; 43:4; 49:9; 56:4; 65:12; Koh. 3:9.

71. The weak non-demonstrative character of אשר in the above sentences is seen from the fact that it is sometimes dispensed with entirely, the clause depending immediately on the preposition: cf. Isa. 65:1, נִדְרַשְׁתִּי לְלוֹא שָׁאָלוּ, "I was consulted by those who did not ask." (לְלוֹא instead of לַאֲשֶׁר לֹא); Jer. 2:8, אַחֲרֵי לֹא־יוֹעִילוּ הָלָכוּ, "After what does not profit they walked"; Jer. 2:11, "My people have changed their glory [בְּלוֹא יוֹעִיל] for what does not profit."

4. *Relative Clauses in Construct State*

72. The principle that an entire clause was conceived by the Hebrew *Sprachbewusstsein* as a single idea and construed as such is further illustrated by the fact that a relative clause very frequently appears as depending on a construct. In the syntactic treatment of this type of sentence, I must again express my dissent with the view of Baumann, Gesenius-Kautzsch, and Philippi. What this view is may be best seen by inserting a few examples with Baumann's rendering. Num. 9:18, כָּל־יְמֵי אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכֹּן הֶעָנָן עַל־הַמִּשְׁכָּן, "die ganze Zeit des: es lagerte u.s.w."; I Kings 21:19, בִּמְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר לָקְקוּ הַכְּלָבִים אֶת־דַּם נָבוֹת, "Am Orte des: es leckten die Hunde Naboths Blut."[1] Similarly Philippi, who renders מְקוֹם אֲשֶׁר יוֹסֵף אָסוּר שָׁם (Gen. 40:3), "der Ort des—dass daselbst Joseph gefangen ist, der Ort des daselbst Gefangenseins Josephs."[2] So far

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 40.

[2] *Status Constr.*, p. 79.

as the *sense* is concerned, these renderings are sufficiently accurate. Philippi's "Der Ort des daselbst Gefangenseins Josephs," which gathers up the relative clause into a single substantive in the genitive, shows a true insight into the nature of the Hebrew construction. Yet it will be noticed that both Philippi's and Baumann's rendering, and especially the latter's, seek to preserve intact and unimpaired the demonstrative character of אֲשֶׁר. In other words, אֲשֶׁר is a true demonstrative in the genitive after the construct יְמֵי or מְקוֹל, while the following clause is in apposition with it. In the light of our whole previous discussion, this syntax cannot be upheld. As in numerous other cases, it assigns to our particle a specific demonstrative meaning such as it does not express. Just what was implied in the אֲשֶׁר in such connections, when the language was still living, it is hazardous for us to decide. There is one thing, however, that is worthy of note. This construction occurs principally after designations of *place* and *time*. May we, therefore, not also here discern a trace of the adverbial character of אשר? It might perhaps be objected that this supposition, while suitable enough after expressions of place, fails when applied to those of time. However, the idea of time as well as place is often conceived locally, spatially. Do we not speak of a "*space* of time" in English, or of a "Zeit*raum*" in German? The latter tongue even goes so far as to use the *local* adverb *wo*, indifferently of place or time, e.g., "die Zeit, *wo*"; "am Tage, *wo*." So also the French. I think, therefore, that we may have in these Hebrew constructions the lingering traces of the adverbial use of אֲשֶׁר. While this *may* be the case, the other supposition that אֲשֶׁר is simply a faded medium of relation satisfies all the requirements. One cannot be dogmatic on this point. For additional examples cf. the grammars, e.g., Davidson, *Syntax*, § 25.

73. Very frequently the אֲשֶׁר is omitted; cf. I Sam. 25:15, כָּל־יְמֵי הִתְהַלַּכְנוּ אִתָּם, rendered by Baumann, "Die ganze Zeit (des:) wir zogen mit ihnen herum." The English equivalent would be, "All the days of our going about with them." Passages of this type are also very common; cf. Ps. 56:10, בְּיוֹם אֶקְרָא, "on the day that I called"; Isa. 29:1, קִרְיַת חָנָה דָוִד, "the city where David encamped"; Job. 18:21, מְקוֹם לֹא יָדַע, "the place of one that knows not [God]." Further citation is unnecessary for our purpose.

c) אֲשֶׁר A VAGUE MEDIUM OF RELATION

74. In addition to what has already been said against the demonstrative theory of אֲשֶׁר, it may further be remarked that there are passages in the Old Testament where אֲשֶׁר is so impalpably vague and elusive as to be untranslatable except by periphrasis. These passages have not received due consideration by the grammars in determining the character of our particle. Cf. the following passages: Judg. 8:15, וַיֹּאמֶר הִנֵּה זֶבַח וְצַלְמֻנָּע אֲשֶׁר חֲרַפְתֶּם אֹתִי, "and he said, Behold Zebah and Zalmunna, concerning whom you taunted me"; Vulg.: *super quibus;* LXX: ἐν οἷς ; Kautzsch: "wegen derer ihr mich gehöhnt habt." A mere glance at this sentence is sufficient to show the vague indeterminateness of אֲשֶׁר. It will tolerate neither a demonstrative, relative, nor conjunctional treatment. It is simply a connective medium, indicating in itself no logical or grammatical relationship between the two clauses. To establish this in accordance with the demands of English syntax, we must have recourse to periphrasis and employ the more definite phrases "concerning whom," "with reference to whom," or something similar. Zech. 11:13, "Cast away the precious wage [אֲשֶׁר יָקַרְתִּי מֵעֲלֵיהֶם] *at which* I had been valued by them." Our rendering "at which" is, of course, determined solely by the free rendering of יָקַרְתִּי. The particle simply links the two statements "goodly price" or "precious wage" and "I had been valued," etc., together, leaving the logical relation to be determined by the reader. Num. 10:32 also belongs here: הַטּוֹב הַהוּא אֲשֶׁר יֵיטִיב יהוה עִמָּנוּ. Here we must render our particle "wherewith," by which it is not meant that it conveyed any such definite meaning to the Hebrew. I Sam. 2:32, בְּכָל־אֲשֶׁר יֵיטִיב אֶת יִשְׂרָאֵל, "in all of that *wherewith* [*as to which*] he shall show kindness to Israel"; II Kings 19:6, "Be not afraid of the words which you have heard [אֲשֶׁר גִּדַּפוּ נְעָרֵי מֶלֶךְ־אַשּׁוּר אֹתִי] *wherewith* the servants of the king of Assyria have blasphemed me." Here again אֲשֶׁר is neither a pronoun nor a conjunction in the real sense of the term. Another instructive passage is Josh. 5:4, וְזֶה הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר־מָל יְהוֹשֻׁעַ. This is usually rendered, "This is the *reason why.*" But דָּבָר does not mean "reason," nor אֲשֶׁר "why." Why should we not have למה following דבר, if the latter really means reason? למה is used in

indirect questions (cf. Dan. 10:20). דָּבָר here simply means *matter, state, condition, Bewandtnis.* The sentence is to be translated somewhat as follows: "This is the matter with reference to Joshua's circumcising"; or, more freely, "Such are the facts concerning Joshua's circumcising," "So verhält es sich damit, dass Josua beschnitt." We find a parallel passage in I Kings 11:27, וְזֶה הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר־הֵרִים יָד בַּמֶּלֶךְ, "Such are the facts concerning his rebellion against the king," "Folgendermassen ging es dabei zu, als er sich gegen den König empörte" (Kittel, *Handkommentar*); Burney (*Notes on Kings*): "and this is the reason why."

75. Sometimes the particle אֲשֶׁר unites two propositions, complete and independent in themselves, in such a way that the verb following אֲשֶׁר governs its own object clause. In these cases also the vague connective character of אֲשֶׁר is evident. Cf. Num. 11:16, "Gather seventy men from the elders of Israel [אֲשֶׁר יָדַעְתָּ כִּי־הֵם זִקְנֵי הָעָם] concerning whom you know that they are elders of the people"; Deut. 9:2, "Thou shalt go in and dispossess [vs. 1] . . . . the sons of Anakim [אֲשֶׁר אַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ וְאַתָּה שָׁמַעְתָּ מִי יִתְיַצֵּב לִפְנֵי בְּנֵי עֲנָק], whom thou knowest and concerning whom thou hast heard, who shall stand," etc.; Deut. 20:20, רַק עֵץ אֲשֶׁר־תֵּדַע כִּי לֹא־עֵץ מַאֲכָל הוּא, "only the trees of which thou knowest that they are not trees for food"; I Sam. 25:11, "And shall I take my slaughter that I have slaughtered for my shearers and give it unto men [אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָדַעְתִּי אֵי מִזֶּה הֵמָּה] concerning whom I do not know whence they come?"

76. The following examples exhibit the same general character as the preceding: Exod. 6:8, וְהֵבֵאתִי אֶתְכֶם אֶל־הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נָשָׂאתִי אֶת־יָדִי לָתֵת אֹתָהּ, "I shall bring you into the land concerning which I sware to give it [*sc.* to your fathers]"; Ezek. 20:42, הָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר נָשָׂאתִי אֶת־יָדִי לָתֵת אֹתָהּ לַאֲבוֹתֵיכֶם, "the land concerning which I sware to give it unto your fathers"; cf. also Josh. 21:43; Ezek. 38:17; Job 30:1; Dan. 9:2. König thinks that sentences of this kind represent the syntactic phenomenon of *Satzverflechtung* in which the אֲשֶׁר appears "als das gemeinsame Objekt zweier Sätze."[1] That is to say (to use Exod. 6:8 for illustration), the אֲשֶׁר is supposed to be at once the object of "נָשָׂאתִי and

[1] *Syntax*, 414 *kl.*

לָתֵת. I doubt very much whether this view is correct. In view of the unquestionable vagueness of אֲשֶׁר in many other cases, it seems to me decidedly preferable to regard it also in the foregoing constructions as a medium of relation pure and simple. And here we may conveniently refer to three other passages similarly treated by König: I Sam. 3:11, "I am about to do a thing in Israel," אֲשֶׁר כָּל־שֹׁמְעוֹ תְּצִלֶּינָה שְׁתֵּי אָזְנָיו, translated by König as follows: *Cuius auditoris cuiusque aures ambae tinnient*[1] ("both ears of every hearer of which shall tingle"). But this is more in harmony with the involved character of Latin syntax than with the Hebrew. Wynkoop (*Syntax*, 41, 3), to my mind, comes much nearer to the Hebrew idiom in rendering "*at which*, if any one heareth it, both his ears shall tingle." Giesebrecht's remark is to the point. He says that in this connection אֲשֶׁר is a "Partikel der Relation im Allgemeinen, etwa s.v.a. *wobei*" (*Handkommentar*). Reproduced in English, אֲשֶׁר is equivalent to some such expression as "with reference to which the following applies," "I shall do a thing" (with reference to which, etc.). The same expression recurs in II Kings 21:12 and Jer. 19:3.

77. Sometimes, according to our grammatical categories, אֲשֶׁר does the service of a partitive genitive; cf. Exod. 1:15, "And the king of Egypt said unto the Hebrew midwives, אֲשֶׁר שֵׁם הָאַחַת שִׁפְרָה וְשֵׁם הַשֵּׁנִית פּוּעָה, Vulg.: *Quarum una vocabatur*, etc.; Exod. 18:3, "[Jethro took] her two sons," אֲשֶׁר שֵׁם הָאֶחָד גֵּרְשֹׁם, Vulg.: *Quorum unus vocabatur;* Judg. 20:31, "In the highways, אֲשֶׁר אַחַת עֹלָה בֵית־אֵל, Vulg.: *quarum una ferebatur in Bethel.* In these cases, אֲשֶׁר is manifestly nothing more than a connective with no syntactic relation at all.

78. I have found one passage in which אֲשֶׁר is equivalent to an accusative of result: Lev. 6:3, וְהֵרִים אֶת־הַדֶּשֶׁן אֲשֶׁר תֹּאכַל הָאֵשׁ אֶת־הָעֹלָה עַל־הַמִּזְבֵּחַ, "And he shall take up the ashes whereto the fire shall consume the burnt-offering on the altar." This passage, along with several others, is quoted by Baumann in a paragraph introduced by the following words: "Im Hebräischen nehmen verschiedene Gruppen von Verben ein direktes Objekt zu sich, wo wir das Verhältnis durch eine Präposition vermitteln." Having

[1] *Syntax*, 412 *l.*

then cited the illustrative examples, he concludes the paragraph with this sentence: "In allen diesen Beispielen ist das in der Gestalt eines Pronominalakkusativs zu erwartende 'Aid ausgelassen."[1] That is to say, the verb אָכַל is supposed to take two accusatives, one representing the direct object (in our verse הָעֹלָה) and another denoting the result. In this way Baumann seeks to rescue אֲשֶׁר for his hypothesis. He conceives of the syntax in this way: "He shall take up the ashes *that*—[into it] [suppressed retrospective] the fire shall consume the burnt-offering." But the verb אָכַל is never employed with two accusatives, but with one only. Consequently, the אֲשֶׁר can be nothing else than a vague connective, equivalent to an accusative of result, according to our mode of thought. A suppression of the 'Âid is out of the question.

79. There is, perhaps, one example where אֲשֶׁר may be said to be employed as an ablative of attendant circumstance; cf. Exod. 6:5, שָׁמַעְתִּי אֶת־נַאֲקַת בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר מִצְרַיִם מַעֲבִדִים אֹתָם, "I have heard the groaning of the Israelites under which the Egyptians hold them in bondage [lit. make them serve]." There is, of course, room for difference of opinion here. "Whom the Egyptians keep in bondage" is the translation adopted by R.V., Baentsch, and others. But the verse is more vividly descriptive of the situation if אֲשֶׁר be made to refer as a connective to נַאֲקַת instead of יִשְׂרָאֵל, thus denoting the circumstances under which the oppression goes on. So Vulg.: *gemitum . . . . quo Aegypti oppresserunt eos.* LXX also refers אֲשֶׁר to groaning, but the translation is too slavishly literal: *στεναγμὸν . . . . ὃν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι καταδουλοῦνται αὐτούς.*

80. It may be that אֲשֶׁר expresses means (always to be borne in mind that the various forces are not inherent in the particle itself); cf. Isa. 50:1, "Where is your mother's bill of divorcement [אֲשֶׁר שִׁלַּחְתִּיהָ] by which I put her away?"; Judg. 9:38, "Where is now thy mouth [אֲשֶׁר תֹּאמַר] with which you spoke?" But cf. explicative clauses in Part II. Josh. 8:26, יָדוֹ אֲשֶׁר נָטָה בַכִּידוֹן, "his hand wherewith he stretched out the javelin"; but, perhaps better, "which he stretched out with the javelin"; cf. Exod. 8:1.

81. It is quite in keeping with the broad and indeterminate nature of אֲשֶׁר that it often dispenses with specifying adjuncts

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 32.

ordinarily employed. This is especially the case when it is used with אָמַר. Ordinarily, the person or thing spoken of is expressed by means of prepositions, such as אֶל or לְ. In relative clauses, however, they are usually omitted; cf. Gen. 43:27, "Is your father well, the old man [אֲשֶׁר אֲמַרְתֶּם] of whom you speak?"; Gen. 43:29, "Is this your little brother [אֲשֶׁר אֲמַרְתֶּם אֵלַי] of whom you spoke to me?"; Exod. 22:8, "Concerning anything that is lost [אֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר] of which one says [*this is it*]"; Num. 14:31, "And your little ones [אֲשֶׁר אֲמַרְתֶּם] of whom you say [they shall be a prey]"; Num. 21:16, "This is the well [אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יהוה לְמֹשֶׁה] concerning which Jahwe spake to Moses"; I Sam. 9:9, הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר אֲמַרְתִּי אֵלֶיךָ, "the man concerning whom I spake to thee." Examples of this kind are very numerous. So also with דָּבָר and בְּעַד.

82. The indefinite character of אֲשֶׁר is further observable in its various uses after time-determinations. It may denote, according as the context requires, (*a*) the time *at* which (point of time), (*b*) the time *during* which (duration of time), and (*c*) the time *within* which an action takes place or a condition exists.

Examples of (*a*): Exod. 13:3, "Remember this day [אֲשֶׁר יְצָאתֶם] when ye went forth"; Num. 15:23, "From the day [אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יהוה] when Jahwe commanded"; Deut. 4:10; 4:32; 9:7; 27:2; Judg. 4:14; II Sam. 19:20; 19:25; I Kings 22:25; Jer. 7:25; Ps. 78:42; Koh. 8:9; Esther 5:13; 9:1; 9:22, "As the days [אֲשֶׁר נָחוּ בָהֶם הַיְּהוּדִים מֵאֹיְבֵיהֶם] wherein the Jews had rest from their enemies." I quote this passage, in particular, because it is the only one that I have found with a retrospective, when אֲשֶׁר is used after designations of time. This passage has been overlooked by Baumann, who says that when אֲשֶׁר belongs to a *Zeitbegriff* the retrospective *fehlt stets*.[1] So also Gesenius-Kautzsch: "Tritt der appositionelle Satz zu einem Zeitbegriff, so fehlt das zurückverweisende Pronomen immer."[2] I Chron. 17:5; II Chron. 6:5.

Examples of (*b*): Deut. 1:46, "According to the days [אֲשֶׁר יְשַׁבְתֶּם] that [during which] ye shall dwell"; Deut. 4:10, "All the days [אֲשֶׁר הֵם חַיִּים עַל־הָאֲדָמָה] that they live upon the earth";

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 33.

[2] § 138 *c*.

Deut. 12:1; 31:13; Judg. 14:17; I Sam. 1:28; 20:31; 27:7, 11; II Sam. 2:11; I Kings 2:11; 8:40; 11:42; 14:20; I Chron. 6:31.

Examples of (*c*): Gen. 45:6, "There are yet five years [אֲשֶׁר אֵין חָרִישׁ וְקָצִיר] in which there shall be no plowing or harvest"; Num. 14:34, "According to the number of days [אֲשֶׁר־תַּרְתֶּם אֶת־הָאָרֶץ] in which you spied out the land"; Deut. 2:14, "and the days [אֲשֶׁר הָלַכְנוּ מִקָּדֵשׁ בַּרְנֵעַ] in which we came from Kadesh-Barnea to," etc.; I Kings 9:10, "At the end of twenty years [אֲשֶׁר בָּנָה שְׁלֹמֹה אֶת־שְׁנֵי הַבָּתִּים] in which Solomon built the two houses."

d) אשר IN CLAUSES OF SPECIFICATION

83. There are a few instances where אֲשֶׁר is employed in what I shall call *specifying relative clauses;* cf. II Sam. 24:10, חָטָאתִי מְאֹד אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי. This is an instructive passage. What is the syntax here? On the demonstrative hypothesis the only possible construction would be to regard אֲשֶׁר as depending on חָטָאתִי as an accusative of nearer definition: "I have sinned greatly with respect to that—I have done [it]." In the light of our whole preceding discussion, this view is to be set aside *a limine.* Nor is אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי simply an independent relative clause: "I have sinned greatly—what I have done." This leaves an intolerable chasm between the two actions. Nor can אֲשֶׁר be purely a connective medium: "I have sinned greatly—[connective]—I have done." The logic of the sentence will help us to determine the syntax. The main sentence חָטָאתִי is a confession, which implies a judgment on the subordinate action. The latter, therefore, must have at least a certain measure of definiteness as a basis for the judgment. This is, of course, not contained in עָשִׂיתִי alone, but only in עָשִׂיתִי plus אֲשֶׁר. The particle, therefore, must have a pronominal content referring to the numbering of the people, for which "David's heart smote him." But since, as we have seen, there is no outward syntactic relation between the intransitive חָטָאתִי, which is complete in itself, and the אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי, there is only one means left to establish the required relation, and that is to regard the clause as the equivalent of a specifying accusative. Thus we arrive at the translation, "I have sinned greatly with respect to what I have done." What has been discussed here with some minuteness was felt by the translators: R.V.: "I

have sinned greatly *in that which* I have done"; Kautzsch: "Ich habe schwer gesündigt mit dem, was ich tat"; the Vulgate cuts the knot with: *Peccavi valde in hoc facto.*

84. A similar passage is Gen. 44:5, הֲרֵעֹתֶם אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם. In the first place, we cannot render, "You have made evil that—you have done [*it*]." Baumann does not treat the passage. Is the structure of the sentence adequately represented by, "You have made evil *what* you have done," making אֲשֶׁר the object of עֲשִׂיתֶם and the entire clause depend as object on הֲרֵעֹתֶם? We feel at once that there is an inconcinnity between "you have made evil" and the supposed objective clause "what you have done" (the same applies to "that"). This analysis implies faulty logic in the utterance. The act to which Joseph refers was evil in itself, and was not subsequently *made evil.* In other words, there was only one action, and not two. This was felt by translators and commentators: "Ye have done evil *in so doing*" (E.V.); "*Daran* habt ihr Übel getan" (Kautzsch); "Eine böse Tat habt ihr begangen" (Keil); "Eine schlechte Tat habt ihr da begangen" (Delitzsch); "Ihr habt übel gehandelt" (Gunkel). Similarly Vulg., *Pessimam rem fecistis.* All these renderings are correct, though somewhat free. But what is the exact syntax? A little investigation will show that we have here a construction of exactly the same type as the one discussed in the preceding paragraph. To prove this, a few remarks on the nature and function of the Hifil are necessary in the first place. The Hifil is of two kinds. Besides the ordinary causative meaning, which needs no further remark, the Hifil has what König calls the "direct causative," Gesenius-Kautzsch, the "inner transitive or intensive" meaning (it is difficult to find an adequate terminology). When thus employed, it indicates that the action or state expressed by the Qal is exercised or put into operation, without, however, terminating on an object. Sometimes, both of these Hifil forces are found with the same verb; cf. Isa. 9:2, הִגְדַּלְתָּ הַשִּׂמְחָה, "he caused joy to be great"; Dan. 9:8, הִגְדִּיל, "[the ram] showed greatness" (used absolutely). Among the numerous examples of the *direct* or *inner causative* Hifil I refer to the following: Isa. 36:21, וַיַּחֲרִישׁוּ, "and they held their peace [*silentium facere*]"; Isa. 1:18, כַּשֶּׁלֶג יַלְבִּינוּ, "they shall become white as snow," i.e., "they shall exhibit

the quality of whiteness"; Dan. 9:5, הִרְשַׁעְנוּ, "we have acted wickedly." For further examples cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 53 *d*, *e*, *f*, and König, I, 204 f.

85. As might be expected, this class of Hifil often receives a nearer definition to indicate the sphere in which the action is exercised or to which it is limited. This specification is added: (1) by means of the infinitive with לְ: cf. Ps. 126:2, הִגְדִּיל יהוה לַעֲשׂוֹת, "Jahwe has manifested greatness in his doings"; II Chron. 26:15, כִּי הִפְלִיא לְהֵעָזֵר, "for he was marvelously helped," i.e., "*he* showed marvelous success in winning victories" (which were attributed to Jahwe. Hence Nif.); I Sam. 16:17, אִישׁ מֵיטִיב לְנַגֵּן, "a man who shows skill in playing"; (2) by means of the infinitive alone: cf. Ezek. 33:32, מֵיטִב נַגֵּן, "one who plays well"; Isa. 23:16; (3) by means of the accusative: cf. Dan. 11:32, מַרְשִׁיעֵי בְרִית, "those acting wickedly with respect to the covenant." I have quoted this passage first, because it shows clearly the nature of the accompanying accusative. Deut. 5:25, הֵיטִיבוּ כָל־אֲשֶׁר דִּבֵּרוּ, "they have done well in all they have said"; Kautzsch, "Sie haben recht mit dem, was sie geredet haben"; not, of course: "They have *made good* all that they have said."

86. And now, having thus cleared the way, we come back to our passage Gen. 44:5, הֲרֵעֹתֶם אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם. The verb רעע is among those most frequently used as an *inner transitive* Hifil; cf. Gen. 19:7, אַל־נָא אַחַי תָּרֵעוּ, "I pray you, my brethren, do not act wickedly"; Judg. 19:23, אַל־אַחַי אַל־תָּרֵעוּ נָא, "do not, my brethren, do not act wickedly"; I Kings 16:25, וַיָּרַע מִכֹּל אֲשֶׁר לִפְנָיו, "and he acted more wickedly than all that were before him"; II Kings 21:11; Isa. 1:16; 11:9; 65:25; Jer. 4:22, etc. Sometimes this Hifil is, as in the examples above, accompanied with the infinitive with לְ; cf. I Kings 14:9, "וְתָרַע לַעֲשׂוֹת, "thou hast acted [more] wickedly in thy doings [than all, etc.]"; Jer. 16:12. It is also found with the accusative; cf. Mic. 3:4, כַּאֲשֶׁר הֵרֵעוּ מַעַלְלֵיהֶם, "according as they have wrought evil in their doings" (R.V.); Jer. 38:9, הֵרֵעוּ הָאֲנָשִׁים הָאֵלֶּה אֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ לִירְמְיָהוּ, "these men have done evil in all that they have done to Jeremiah." These accusatives are specifying in character. Consequently, in our passage הֲרֵעֹתֶם אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם it is the אֲשֶׁר-clause that furnishes

the necessary specification to הֲרֵעֹתֶם. "You have done evil with respect to what you have done" is the only possible construction. Thus it will be seen that the clause is employed in exactly the same way as in II Sam. 24:10; cf. also Deut. 18:7, הֵיטִיבוּ אֲשֶׁר דִּבֵּרוּ, "they have done well as to what they have said"; R.V.: "They have well said that which they have spoken" implies a misunderstanding of the syntax.

The bearing of these passages on the demonstrative theory is obvious.

e) MISCELLANEOUS

87. The particle אֲשֶׁר may refer to an entire sentence; cf. Exod. 10:6, "And thy houses shall be filled [with locusts], and the houses of thy servants"; אֲשֶׁר לֹא־רָאוּ אֲבֹתֶיךָ; LXX: ἃ οὐδέποτε ἑώρακασιν οἱ πατέρες σου; Vulg.: *Quantam non viderunt patres* (making אֲשֶׁר refer to *locusta* and the end of vs. 4). This is wrong. R.V. as Baentsch: "*Wie* es deine Vorfahren nie erlebt haben." This is correct. The context shows that אֲשֶׁר sums up the preceding statements about the plague of locusts and is equivalent to "a thing such as," *quale*. Similarly, the Syriace ܕ introduces, at times, a relative clause referring to an entire sentence, but in this case it is always preceded by a correlative.[1] The Assyrian ša occasionally performs the same function. Jer. 7:31, "and they have built high places of Topheth . . . . to burn their sons and daughters in the fire [אֲשֶׁר לֹא צִוִּיתִי וְלֹא עָלְתָה עַל־לִבִּי] which I commanded them not, neither came it into my mind"; cf. also 32:35; Esther 4:16, "And so I will go to the king [אֲשֶׁר לֹא כַדָּת] which is not according to the law."

88. In at least one instance אֲשֶׁר depends on a preposition in the same way as an Indo-European relative; cf. Gen. 31:32, עִם אֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָא אֶת אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא יִחְיֶה, "with whom thou findest thy gods, [he] shall not live." Ordinarily, the construction would be אֲשֶׁר עִמּוֹ. Boettcher is the only one, so far as I am aware, who assumes a disorder in the text. Sperling and Baumann, accepting the text as correct, hold that this is the only instance of the kind in the Old Testament. Perhaps this view is correct. The other passages usually referred to as exhibiting the same construction are by no means as clear as Gen. 31:32; cf. Isa. 47:12,

[1] Nöldeke, *Syr. Grammatik*, § 356.

עֲמֹד־נָא בְּחֲבָרֶיךָ וּבְרֹב כְּשָׁפֶיךָ בַּאֲשֶׁר יָגַעְתָּ מִנְּעוּרֶיךָ, "Stand forth now with thy spells and the multitude of thy enchantments wherein thou hast labored from thy youth." The question is whether the ב before אֲשֶׁר belongs to עֲמֹד at the beginning of the sentence (so Davidson) or to יָגַעְתָּ (so Delitzsch and Wynkoop). בַּאֲשֶׁר would thus be employed for the ordinary אֲשֶׁר בָּהֶם. In favor of this view is the fact that the verb יגע is ordinarily construed with ב; cf. Isa. 43:22; 62:8; Josh. 24:13. But it is not to be overlooked that other verbs, usually construed with a preposition (e.g., אָמַר already referred to, דָּבַר, and בָּחַר), frequently omit the preposition when used in connection with אֲשֶׁר. The same thing may have taken place with יָגַע. Moreover (if the text is correct), we have אֲשֶׁר יָגַעְתָּ without a preposition in vs. 15 of the same chapter. Rather, therefore, than assume the anomalous בַּאֲשֶׁר as being employed for אֲשֶׁר בָּהֶם, I prefer to make the preposition depend on עֲמֹד at the beginning of the sentence, and render thus: "Stand forth . . . . thy spells . . . . with what thou hast labored," etc., making the clause not attributive but *appositional* to the preceding nouns. Isa. 56:4 need not detain us long. The words are בְּחֲרוּ בַּאֲשֶׁר חָפַצְתִּי, "Choose what pleases me." Again Wynkoop says בַּאֲשֶׁר = אֲשֶׁר בּוֹ. There can be no question that בַּ depends on בְּחָרוּ and subordinates the entire clause. חָפֵץ requires no preposition, being often construed with the accusative; cf. Isa. 55:11, כִּי אִם עָשָׂה אֶת־אֲשֶׁר חָפַצְתִּי, "but accomplishes that which I please"; Isa. 1:11. Finally, Zech. 12:10 may be briefly discussed here. The passage reads וְהִבִּיטוּ אֵלַי אֵת אֲשֶׁר־דָּקָרוּ, "They shall look upon me, whom they have pierced." König accepts this as an undoubted instance of the relative use of אֲשֶׁר in the ordinary sense of the term. So, many interpreters: G. A. Smith: "They shall look to him [reading אֵלָיו for אֵלַי] whom they have pierced"; Briggs: "They . . . . upon me, whom they have pierced"; Vulg.: *Adspicient ad me quem confixerunt.* Others assume textual corruption; e.g., Baumann, Gesenius-Kautzsch, Wellhausen, Nowack. Keil thinks that the אֵת before אֲשֶׁר is added for sake of clearness, since the particle אֲשֶׁר might otherwise be regarded as the subject of דָּקָרוּ. Nowack says the expression is *unhebräisch.* There may be a parallel case in Jer. 38:9, "These men have done evil [אֵת כָּל־אשר] with respect to all that they have

done unto Jeremiah [אֵת אֲשֶׁר הִשְׁלִיכוּ אֶל־בּוֹר] whom [?] they cast into the pit." Giesebrecht simply cancels the את before אֲשֶׁר. König says it means "mit Bezug darauf, dass." This may be correct, and it may not. With the means at our disposal there seems to be no possibility of definitely deciding. If אֵת אֲשֶׁר be retained in the sense of *whom*, we must admit that it is very unusual, but no more so than עִמּוֹ אֲשֶׁר in Gen. 31:32.

89. "Ganz eigentümlich," says the grammar of Gesenius-Kautzsch, "ist der absolute Gebrauch von אֲשֶׁר in der Formel אֲשֶׁר הָיָה דְבַר יהוה אֶל־ '*das* [ists]—es erging als Wort Jahwes an.'" This is, indeed, somewhat "peculiar," but not without analogies in other Semitic languages. Besides, the expression "absolute Gebrauch" is misleading, growing out of the attempt to save the demonstrative character of the particle. What we have here is an inversion of the usual order in the structure of dependent relative clauses, inasmuch as the antecedent is drawn into the clause. Here we can adopt König's *Satzverflechtung* or, as sometimes called, *Satzverschränkung*. I have found twelve instances of the attraction of the antecedent by the relative clause. Of these König cites six (*Lehrgeb.*, III, 414 f.). Four occur in Jeremiah, all having the same form as the example above; cf. Jer. 14:1; 46:1; 47:1; 49:34, "That which came as Jahwe's word." For the remaining examples cf. Num. 33:4, וּמִצְרַיִם מְקַבְּרִים אֵת אֲשֶׁר הִכָּה יהוה בָּהֶם כָּל־בְּכוֹר, "while the Egyptians were burying all the firstborn whom Jahwe had smitten among them"; I Sam. 24:19, וְאַתָּה הִגַּדְתָּ הַיּוֹם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־עָשִׂיתָ אִתִּי טוֹבָה [הִגְדַּלְתָּ?], "And thou hast declared this day the good which thou hast done me" (so, if we adopt the Massoretic reading); adopting the proposed emendation, "And thou hast increased this day," etc. Nowack, "Und zwar hast du heute noch vermehrt, was du Gutes an mir gethan hast," conforming exactly to the Hebrew construction. I Sam. 25:30, "And it shall come to pass when Jahwe shall have done to my lord [כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־דִּבֶּר אֶת־הַטּוֹבָה עָלֶיךָ], according to all the good that he has spoken concerning thee." II Kings 12:6, "They shall repair the breaches of the house [לְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־יִמָּצֵא שָׁם בֶּדֶק], according to every breach that is found there." (But, perhaps, it is preferable to join שָׁם with אשר, "according to every place where a breach is found." Then there is no attraction. König, however,

counts this passage among his examples.) Ezek. 12:25, אֲדַבֵּר אֶת אֲשֶׁר אֲדַבֵּר דָּבָר, "I shall speak the word that I will speak." Toy rejects אֲדַבֵּר אֵת אֲשֶׁר (*SBOT*), but this is unnecessary. The text, as it stands, expresses the determination of Jahwe to announce his will more strongly than if the words are omitted, and this suits the purport of the whole passage. Ezek. 12:28, אֲשֶׁר אֲדַבֵּר דָּבָר וְיֵעָשֶׂה, "the word which I shall speak shall be performed"; Exod. 25:9, כְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי מַרְאֶה אוֹתְךָ אֵת תַּבְנִית הַמִּשְׁכָּן וְאֵת תַּבְנִית כָּל־כֵּלָיו, "according to all that I shall show thee, the model of the tabernacle and the model of all the furniture thereof"; II Kings 8:12, "Because I know [אֵת אֲשֶׁר־תַּעֲשֶׂה לִבְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל רָעָה] the evil that thou will do unto the children of Israel." In all these cases, the relative particle with which the sentence begins, and which is necessarily vague, receives the required specification by the following noun. Hence we may say that the antecedent is drawn into the clause, though this refers only to the external make-up. No doubt, there is a psychological basis for such constructions. To venture an explanation, I should say that the statement is begun without the necessary clearness and distinctness, this again naturally calling for a supplementary word in order to render the expression sufficiently precise. Hence the unusual position of these "antecedents." On this principle we explain another passage, which, though differing from the above in one respect, may be properly inserted here. In Amos 5:1 we have the following: שִׁמְעוּ אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי נֹשֵׂא עֲלֵיהֶם קִינָה, "Hear this word, which I lift up for you—a lamentation." This passage differs from the above in that the אֲשֶׁר has an antecedent, while it agrees with them in having an additional word in the clause for the sake of clearness and precision. Constructions of this kind are found in other Semitic languages, especially in Ethiopic, less frequently in Syriac[1] and Assyrian. Cf. Tâbti ḳâtuššun uba'ima ša epuššunûti dunḳu, "My favor I required at their hands, the kindness which I showed them"; literally, "what I did unto them by way of kindness."[2]

90. We also find that the relative clause precedes its antecedent. I have found two instances of this kind, Gen. 46:20, "And unto Joseph were born in the land of Egypt [אֲשֶׁר יָלְדָה־לּוֹ אָסְנַת],

[1] Cf. Nöldeke, *Syrische Grammatik*, § 352.

[2] Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, § 147, 1.

whom Asnath bore him . . . . [אֶת־מְנַשֶּׁה וְאֶת־אֶפְרָיִם], Manasseh and Ephraim" (accusative after impersonal use of passive; cf. the grammars). Both Gunkel and Ball reject the relative clause as a redactional addition. If it be such, we should expect the redactor to have put the clause in a more natural position, that is, *after* the antecedent. Gunkel further suggests the addition of בָּנִים before אֲשֶׁר. In this way, irregularities are easily overcome. Again, we find the same construction in other Semitic languages; cf. u l ipšaḫ ša êzuzu kabitti belûtišunu, "not was pacified the heart of their lordship, which was angry."[1] Hence there is no cogent reason for rejecting the clause on grammatical grounds. Cf. also Josh. 18:2, שֶׁאֵר לֹא־חִלְּקוּ אֶת־נַחֲלָתָם שִׁבְעָה שְׁבָטִים, "And there remained among the children of Israel seven tribes, who had not divided their inheritance."

91. As for the position of אֲשֶׁר, it follows, as a rule, immediately upon the antecedent. But there are exceptions, the particle being sometimes removed from its antecedent by intervening words. Thus we find it separated by a participial phrase; cf. Gen. 21:3, "And Abraham called the name of his son [הַנּוֹלַד־לוֹ] that was born unto him [אֲשֶׁר יָלְדָה־לּוֹ], whom Sarah bare unto him, Isaac"; Josh. 2:3, "Bring forth the men [הַבָּאִים אֵלֶיךָ אֲשֶׁר בָּאוּ לְבֵיתֶךָ], that have come to thee, that have entered into thy house." So, if the clause in this case is original. Lev. 11:21, "But this ye shall eat of all the winged creeping things [הַהֹלֵךְ עַל אַרְבַּע אֲשֶׁר לוֹ כְרָעַיִם מִמַּעַל לְרַגְלָיו] that goes upon all fours that has legs upon its feet." In this case the clause restricts the idea expressed by the preceding participle. The separation becomes still greater, when in addition to a participial phrase another relative clause intervenes between אֲשֶׁר and its antecedent; cf. Ezra 2:1–2, "These are the children of the province [הָעֹלִים מִשְּׁבִי הַגּוֹלָה אֲשֶׁר הֶגְלָה נְבוּכַדְנֶצַּר מֶלֶךְ־בָּבֶל לְבָבֶל וַיָּשׁוּבוּ לִירוּשָׁלַם . . . . (2) אֲשֶׁר־בָּאוּ עִם־זְרֻבָּבֶל . . . .] that went up out of the captivity of those carried away, whom Nebuchadnezzar had carried away . . . . and [*who*] returned unto Jerusalem; (2) who came with Zerubbabel. . . . ." A similar construction, but without a preceding participle, is found in II Chron. 32:14, מִי בְּכָל־אֱלֹהֵי הַגּוֹיִם הָאֵלֶּה אֲשֶׁר הֶחֱרִימוּ אֲבוֹתַי אֲשֶׁר יָכוֹל לְהַצִּיל אֶת־עַמּוֹ,

[1] Delitzsch, *Assyrische Grammatik*, § 147, 1.

"who [was there] among all the gods of those nations whom my fathers destroyed, who was able to rescue his people?" In like manner, a temporal clause may intervene; cf. Gen. 41:50, "And unto Joseph were born two sons [בְּטֶרֶם תָּבוֹא שְׁנַת הָרָעָב אֲשֶׁר יָלְדָה־לּוֹ אָסְנַת] before the year of the famine came, whom Asnath bore unto him." Again, the verb of the principal clause may separate the particle from its antecedent; cf. I Sam. 10:16, וְאֶת־דְּבַר הַמְּלוּכָה לֹא־הִגִּיד לוֹ אֲשֶׁר אָמַר שְׁמוּאֵל, "But the matter of the kingdom he made not known unto him, whereof Samuel had spoken." So far as the grammar is concerned, there is no reason for rejecting the relative clause. Cf. also Isa. 30:24. The same construction is found in Assyrian, e.g., ḳâtâšu ukarrit ša ḳaštu iṣbatû ana miṯḫuṣi Ašur, "I cut off his hands, which seized the bow to fight against Ashur."[1] Cf. also Isa. 29:22, "Thus says Jahwe [אֶל־בֵּית יַעֲקֹב אֲשֶׁר פָּדָה אֶת־אַבְרָהָם] concerning the house of Israel, who redeemed Abraham." Duhm remarks on this passage, "Allerdings ist der Relativsatz jetzt reichlich weit von dem Substantiv getrennt; eben deshalb muss man mit Lowth im Vorhergehenden אֶל statt אֶל sprechen. Darum spricht Jahwe, der Gott des Houses Israel, der Abraham erlöste." In the light of similar constructions, this objection has no weight. For other examples of a different kind, cf. Gen. 24:24; I Sam. 29:3.

92. Occasionally a relative clause with אֲשֶׁר continues an idea begun with a participle; cf. Josh. 24:17, ... הוּא הַמַּעֲלֶה אֹתָנוּ וְאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לְעֵינֵינוּ אֶת־הָאֹתֹת הַגְּדֹלוֹת הָאֵלֶּה, "He it is that has brought us up [out of the land of Egypt] and that has performed these signs in our eyes," Mic. 3:3, שֹׂנְאֵי טוֹב וְאֹהֲבֵי רָעָה וְאֲשֶׁר אָכְלוּ שְׁאֵר עַמִּי, "Ye that hate good and love evil and that devour the flesh of my people."

f) THE RETROSPECTIVE COMPLEMENT

93. Baumann attaches much importance to the ʿÂid as supporting his theory of the character and syntax of אֲשֶׁר. He calls particular attention to the retrospective in relative clauses belonging to an antecedent in the first or second person. In these cases the complement appears either as a separate pronoun, or suffix, or inflectional addition (according to the nature of the sentence), almost exclusively in the same person as the antecedent. The following

[1] Kraetzschmar, *BA*, I, 422.

examples will illustrate: Gen. 45:4, אֲנִי יוֹסֵף אֲחִיכֶם אֲשֶׁר־מְכַרְתֶּם אֹתִי, "I am Joseph your brother, whom ye have sold"; Isa. 49:23, אֲנִי יהוה אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵבֹשׁוּ קֹוָי, "I am Jahwe, in whom those that trust shall not be ashamed"; Deut. 5:6, אֲנֹכִי יהוה אֲשֶׁר הוֹצֵאתִיךָ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם, "I am Jahwe, who brought thee out of the land of Egypt"; Isa. 51:17, קוּמִי יְרוּשָׁלִַם אֲשֶׁר שָׁתִית מִיַּד יהוה אֶת־כּוֹס חֲמָתוֹ, "Arise, Jerusalem, that *hast* drunk from the hand of Jahwe the cup of his wrath."

94. On the basis of these facts, Baumann makes the summary statement that the possibility of such a construction is conditioned by his view of the nature and syntax of the relative particle;[1] i.e., אֲשֶׁר is a demonstrative belonging to the antecedent, having, therefore, no influence on the attributive clause. It is true, this explanation fits the case. But this alone does not *prove* the correctness of the theory. A stringent proof must exclude the possibility of any other explanation of the phenomenon in question. This, however, is not the case. We, who reject the demonstrative theory, can easily find another explanation. The principle involved here is not a great anomaly at all. While it is true that, as a rule, we should expect the third person in the verb of the relative clause, the correspondence of the person of the verb with that of the antecedent is not without analogy—is, in fact, quite common even in Indo-European. Indeed, to a certain extent, it is the only normal and admissible usage. In the last passage cited above the use of the third person in the relative clause would be impossible. "Arise, Jerusalem, that *hast* drunk" is required by the English *usus loquendi*, and is by no means, of course, an accommodation to the Hebrew form of expression. So also the German "die *du* getrunken *hast*" (Luther and Kautzsch). Cf. Milton: "Thou, O Spirit, that *dost* prefer before all temples the upright heart and pure" (*Paradise Lost*, I, 17). If the antecedent be in the first person, the English again admits the first person in the verb of the relative clause. Deut. 5:6 employs the imperfect in English ("who brought thee"), and hence does not furnish an illustration; but suppose we substitute the perfect ("I am Jahwe who *have* brought thee"), should we then violate the English idiom? Cf. Scott: "It will break my heart that *have* been toiling more like a dog than a man" (*Rob Roy*); Chaucer: "A tale of me that *am* a

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 29.

pover man" (*Canterbury Tales*). The same phenomenon is very common in Latin; cf. *Quaeso, parce, inquit, mihi, quae tibi molestis muribus purgo* [instead of *purgat*] *domum* (*Phaedrus* i. 22. 3); *Haec omnia feci, qui sodalis Dolabellae eram* [instead of *erat*].[1] It is not unknown in Greek; cf. Ἄγοιτ' ἂν μάταιον ἀνδρ' ἐκποδὼν, ὃς . . . . κάκτανον [instead of κάκτανε] (Sophocles *Antigone* 1339).

95. The tendencies of language exhibited by these examples show plainly that the use of the second or first person in the verb of the relative clause decides nothing with reference to the syntactic position of the introductory particle. If an undoubted relative, about whose syntactic position, as belonging to the dependent clause, there is no question, can be so far weakened as to lose the grammatical control of its predicate, the latter agreeing in person with the antecedent instead of with its subject, what may we not expect in the case of so vague and indefinite a word as אֲשֶׁר? For vague and indefinite it is on any theory of its origin. In an earlier part of this dissertation I have already indicated to what extent the use of אֲשֶׁר may be paralleled by that of the German *wo*. So I need not repeat my remarks on this point here. To show the weakness of the demonstrative theory still more, I should like to add that Baumann's mode of reasoning will apply equally well to the English and other examples just cited and, if applied, will lead to some very preposterous conclusions. How easy to show, for instance, that in the sentence, "Stand up, Jerusalem, that hast drunk," "that" must belong appositionally to Jerusalem, as may be seen from the *second* person in the verb! But English being a living language, we make no such blunders. The real explanation of the phenomenon we are considering is, to my mind, to be found in the fact that these clauses contain a kind of latent anacoluthon, though, of course, not felt as such. While the clause is begun with the relative strictly requiring a verb in the third person, the *first* person (or *second*, as the case may be) of the antecedent as the *real agens* forces itself upon the consciousness of the speaker and insensibly gives a twist to the construction. In other words, the logic and psychology of the utterance take precedence over strict grammatical sequence and accuracy. The relative, in such cases, shows a tendency, even in Indo-European, to become a conjunctive particle between the main and subordinate propositions.

[1] Cf. Lane, *Latin Grammar*, § 1807.

And this tendency would be proportionately stronger with the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר, resulting in constructions that we can no longer imitate in modern languages.

96. Baumann remarks further: "Die ganz gleiche Erscheinung [i.e., the correspondence of the person of the retrospective with that of the antecedent] finden wir auch in den anderen semitischen Sprachen."[1] This is not quite true. Before Baumann's dissertation appeared the investigations of Kraetzschmar with reference to the Assyrian ša had shown that in the Assyrian the person of the retrospective is wholly independent of the person of the antecedent. In other words, the retrospective appears invariably in the *third* person, though the clause may refer to an antecedent in the first or second person. Kraetzschmar says: "Das Assyrische steht also in dieser Hinsicht noch auf einer ursprünglicheren Stufe als die übrigen semitischen Sprachen."[2] Cf. šarru ša ilu idûšu atta, "thou art a king whom God has known"; Mannu atta ša ana šarrûtu inambušu, "whoever thou mayest be, whom they have called to exercise royalty"; Anaku ša ana šimat šarrûtu išimû šimatsu, "I, whose lot they appointed for the exercise of royalty." In view of this fact, Baumann's argument on the basis of the retrospective is invalid.

97. In this connection, a word may be said about König's view of the origin of the 'Âid. In explaining the origin of the relative construction, König sets out from the idea that originally two independent propositions were paratactically co-ordinated without a conjunctive word of any kind (*Asyndetische Parataxe*). Accordingly, the sentence אֲנֹכִי יוֹסֵף אֲשֶׁר מְכַרְתֶּם אֹתִי would consist originally of the two separate statements, "I am Joseph," "Ye sold me." As König puts it, "das Identifizierungselement (arab. 'Aidun) besass im allgemeinen die Priorität der Existenz vor dem die Relation vermittelnden Pronomen."[3] This asyndetic juxtaposition, König remarks, is very common in poetic language, which has a tendency to retain or revive archaic forms of expression. Later on, when the *usus loquendi* began to "bridge over" the *parataktische Asyndese*, that is to say, when by the introduction of the relative particle the subordinate construction began to displace the co-ordinate, the original form of the clause was in most cases (*allermeist*) left un-

[1] *Op. cit.*, p. 28. [2] *BA*, I, 424. [3] *Lehrgeb.*, III, § 384.

changed. The word first employed to establish this relation was the demonstrative זֶה, and then שׁ and אשר were similarly used.[1] There seems to be much speculation in all this. At any rate, it is very precarious, in the absence of clear data, to give an account of the origin of certain modes of expression. While poetry has the tendency ascribed to it by König, it also has a tendency to be more concise and succinct than prose, thus dispensing with all unnecessary verbiage. The fact, therefore, that אֲשֶׁר is comparatively rare in the poetic sections does not necessarily prove that they represent a stage of language prior to the general use of אשר, but simply that the particle was dispensed with as not being absolutely required. On other grounds, however, we may safely assume that אשר came in later as a relative particle than the demonstrative זֶה or שׁ. אֲשֶׁר, as an original noun of place, could, of course, not have performed the function of a relative particle, until it had all but lost its primitive meaning, whereas the most obvious word to introduce an attributive clause is a demonstrative.[2] When, however, אֲשֶׁר *was* introduced, it would not, by reason of its already faded character, affect the structure of the sentence, at the same time following as closely as possible the analogy of זֶה or שׁ. In this way, the general correspondence between the construction of the demonstrative relatives and that of אֲשֶׁר is to be explained. I say *general*, for, as we have seen in the preceding pages, the difference remained, in some respects, so apparent as to show that אֲשֶׁר cannot be traced to a demonstrative source.

98. It is not my intention here to discuss the ʿÂid in all its aspects. This would be, in large measure, simply to restate what has already been said by others. Nevertheless, my study of the subject has led to some results at variance with the statements of a grammar so widely used as Gesenius-Kautzsch. Consequently, I shall record these results. With reference to the suppression of the ʿÂid, the grammar makes the following statement: "Diese Unterdrückung des rückbezüglichen Pronomens findet besonders dann statt, wenn es . . . . als *Pronomen separatum* einen Subjekts-nominativ im Nominalsatz repräsentieren würde. . . . . Nur in

[1] *Op. cit.*, § 59 ff.

[2] Cf. the English "that," which is very old as a relative, whereas "who" and "which," originally interrogatives, came into use much later.

negativen Nominalsätzen wird das rückbezügliche Pronomen nicht selten beigefügt."[1] I have found the contrary to be the case. As a matter of fact, there are in all thirty-five instances of this use of the pronominal complement in nominal relative clauses in the Old Testament. Of this number, *fifteen* are found in *negative* clauses, and *twenty* in *positive*. The examples of the first class are the following: Gen. 7:2, 8; 17:12; 20:33; Lev. 11:26; Num. 17:5; Deut. 17:15; 20:15; Judg. 19:12; I Sam. 11:7; I Kings 8:41; 9:20; Koh. 8:13; II Chron. 6:22; 8:7 (the last two being parallel to I Kings 8:41 and 9:20 respectively). The following are the examples of the second class: Gen. 9:3; Lev. 11:26, 39; Num. 9:13; 14:8, 27; 35:31; Deut. 20:20; I Sam. 10:19; II Kings 25:19; Jer. 27:9; 52:25; Ezek. 20:32; 43:19; Had. 1:9; Ps. 16:3; Ruth 4:15; Koh. 4:2; 7:26; Neh. 2:18. Of these, Ezek. 20:32 and Ps. 16:3 may be questioned. In the former passage, אֲשֶׁר is by many taken as a conjunction, though there is no strict necessity for this. As for Ps. 16:3, which, if we adopt the present punctuation, אֲשֶׁר בָּאָרֶץ הֵמָּה would present the only instance in the Old Testament where the retrospective is separated from the אֲשֶׁר in positive sentences, the text is probably corrupt. Driver suggests אֲשֶׁר בָּאֲרֶץ הֵמָּה. In all negative sentences the retrospective is invariably separated from the particle.

99. From the grammar referred to it would appear furthermore that the 'Â i d is more frequently found in negative relative clauses of a nominal character than in verbal clauses in which the 'Â i d represents the object. "Diese Unterdrückung findet besonders dann statt, wenn es [i.e., the 'Â i d] einen Objektsaccusativ . . . . repräsentieren würde. . . . . Nur in negativen Nominalsätzen wird das rückbezügliche Pronomen nicht selten beigefügt." I have found that the 'Â i d as representing *einen Objektsaccusativ* is much more common than in either type of nominal clauses where it represents the *Subjektsnominativ*. If none has escaped my notice, there are sixty instances of the kind in the Old Testament. Cf. Gen. 5:29; 21:2; 27:27; 45:4; Exod. 6:5; 25:2; 28:3; Lev. 16:32; 23:2, 27; 25:42; Num. 13:32; 34:13; 35:25; Deut. 11:12; 12:2; 13:3; 18:14, 21, 22; 20:48; 29:25; 31:4; 32:46; 34:10; Josh. 2:10; 10:25; 14:1; I Kings 9:21; 11:34; 21:25; II Kings 16:3 (cf.

[1] § 138 *b*.

17:8 for the same construction without the retrospective); 19:4; Isa. 19:25; 28:4; 29:11; 37:4; 62:2; Jer. 8:2 (thrice); 19:4; 27:20; 29:22; 44:3; Ezek. 4:10; 5:16; 15:6; 20:13; 32:9; 36:21; Zech. 7:14; Ps. 1:4; 88:6; 94:12; 107:2; Koh. 7:11; Esther 7:5; 10:2; II Chron. 22:7.

100. That there is one case of a retrospective after a time-designation has already been pointed out. Cf. § 82.

In concluding this part of our task, I should like to add a few further remarks by way of reinforcing the criticism attempted in the foregoing pages of the syntax of אֲשֶׁר. Granted the demonstrative origin of our particle, there is still an Achilles heel in the Boettcher-Baumann syntax. This lies in the fact that no allowance is made for syntactic shiftings and changes, such as are sure to take place more or less in every living language. Boettcher and his followers confound the results of historico-philological science (assuming אֲשֶׁר to be a demonstrative) with the actual *usus loquendi*. It is a philological truism that whatever the *origin* of a certain construction may have been, the later usage may be something totally different. This principle applies in particular to the mutual relation between the main and subordinate propositions. Here a particle or a pronoun that belonged primarily to the main sentence has in numerous instances insensibly shifted its syntactic position, being then conceived by the *Sprachgefühl* as belonging to the subordinate clause. Such is the case in Latin; cf. *Simulatque* (*simulac*) *de Caesaris adventu cognitum est, ad eum venit* (*De bello Gall.* v. 33). In constructions of this kind *atque* belonged originally to the main sentence *ad eum venit;* but it united with *simul* and was then no longer felt to belong to *venit.* So also *postquam, priusquam,* etc. Similarly in English, e.g., "as soon as," and in German *so bald als, auch wenn,* etc., one element of these particles belonging originally to the main proposition; but, coalescing later with the other particle, both were then felt as introducing the dependent clause. A very instructive example of this kind is the commonest of all English or German conjunctions, namely "that," *dass.* "'Ich sehe, dass er zufrieden ist,' ist hervorgegangen aus: 'Ich sehe das: er ist zufrieden.'"[1] In other words, what was originally a demonstrative pronoun belonging syntactically to the governing sentence has detached itself from its primary position as object of the main clause and become the introductory particle of the subordinate clause.

A similar phenomenon is noticeable in tracing the development of the demonstrative pronoun into the relative. There can be no doubt that the relative demonstratives "that," *der, die, das,* belonged at the outset to the main sentence, but in process of time they were drawn into the relative clause.

[1] Paul, *Principien der Sprachgeschichte,* § 211.

This is attested by the fact that side by side with the demonstratives the interrogative pronouns, "who," "which," *welcher, welche, welches,* have assumed the relative function, which could have occurred only after the demonstratives had severed their connection with the principal proposition and attached themselves syntactically to the secondary clause.

The same thing has admittedly—though, of course, not to such a degree—taken place at least in some Semitic languages. This, too, Baumann concedes. Are we then to assume that אשר (granting it to have been a demonstrative) remained fixed and stationary throughout its entire history; that, in short, a relative construction never arose? We have seen that even the Arabic الذى showed a tendency to shift, according to Reckendorf. And though we might demur with reference to the Arabic for the reason that الذى is declinable, there is nothing that could have checked אֲשֶׁר in a similar way, since it is invariable for gender, number, or case. König is, therefore, undoubtedly right when he says that, e.g., בּוֹ . . . . אֲשֶׁר might have been conceived *relatively* just as well as the English expression, "The age *which* we live *in*."[1] What is this "in" but a kind of retrospective giving the "which" its necessary definition and clearness? In view of all this I contend that the demonstrative theory of the syntax of אֲשֶׁר cannot be successfully maintained, even if the premise of the demonstrative origin of the particle be granted.

ADDENDUM

A passage that also deserves notice as illustrating the indefinite non-demonstrative character of אשר is Gen. 30:29, "And he said unto him [יָדַעְתָּ אֵת אֲשֶׁר עָבַדְתִּיךָ וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר הָיָה מִקְנְךָ אִתִּי], Thou knowest how I served thee and how thy cattle have fared with me" (R.V.). In neither of these clauses will the demonstrative theory apply. To take the first את אשר as object of יָדַעְתָּ, "Thou knowest that," leaves the עבדתיך destitute of meaning and destroys all connection. But perhaps אשר is here a conjunction: "Thou knowest *that* I served thee." This is self-evident and devoid of force. We are then shut up to the rendering "Thou knowest *what* I served thee," the entire clause being the object of יָדַעְתָּ. The את אשר is here used as a cognate accusative depending on עָבַדְתִּיךָ.[2] In the second clause, אשר introduces what in modern terminology is called an indirect question: "Thou knowest *what* thy cattle *have become* [this is the force of הָיָה] with me." A moment's reflection will again show the impossibility of making אֵת אֲשֶׁר depend on יָדַעְתָּ.

[1] *Lehrgeb.*, III, § 62.

[2] Some supply עָבַדְתִּי before אשר, after Syr., but this is not required.

PART II

THE CONJUNCTIONAL USE OF אשר AND ITS COMPOUNDS

a) אשר USED ALONE

101. To explain the conjunctional use of אשר, we cannot have recourse to the analogy of Semitic demonstratives such as ša, ܕ, דִּי, which, it is well known, have, to a certain extent, assumed the functions of a conjunction. Though the usage in both cases is within certain limits naturally the same, the process of development resulting in such usage is wholly different. With regard to the demonstratives, we have the familiar phenomenon, already pointed out, that the original pronoun was employed to introduce the subordinate clause. In the case of אשר, however, the matter is different. The origin of its conjunctional use is to be sought in its vague and indeterminate character as a medium of relation. As such it could be employed indifferently to connect a sentence with a single word (antecedent) or with another sentence. Hence also the great variety of uses which it exhibits. No Semitic demonstrative that has passed into a conjunction covers as large a territory as does the Hebrew particle אשר. Thus the Assyrian ša never expresses purpose, result, condition, or time (unless a time-designation has preceded). The same may be said of the Aramaic דִּי, though this occurs in final clauses when the latter are at the same time the object of the main verb. The nearest approach to the extensive conjunctional use of אֲשֶׁר is found in the Syriac ܕ, though it, too, is not as far-reaching as אֲשֶׁר. Expressed in our grammatical categories, אֲשֶׁר may introduce subject, object, causal, final, consecutive, conditional, explicative, concessive, temporal,[1] and modal clauses. It may also introduce a direct quotation. It need hardly be added that it never occurred to the Hebrew consciousness to make any

[1] Somewhat uncertain (when no time-designation precedes).

such grammatical classifications as the above in the conjunctional use of אשר. The latter never acquired any specific meaning as either a causal, conditional, or any other conjunction. It was never anything more than a general connective, the exact logical relation between the main and dependent clauses being instinctively felt in the living language.

102. It is not surprising, therefore, that grammarians and interpreters differ so widely in many cases in dealing with אשר. Indeed, in not a few instances, it seems impossible to decide just what modern conjunction deserves the preference in rendering the conjunctional אשר. In the treatment of this elusive particle there will always be an element of uncertainty and hence diversity of opinion. Upon the whole, I am inclined to think that a conjunctional use has been assumed in more cases than is necessary. This applies in particular to the causal use.

אשר *in Subject Clauses*[1]

103. אשר may introduce a subject clause. This usage occurs with growing frequency in the later books. It is especially common in Koheleth. The following passages occur: Num. 9:20, וַיֵּשׁ אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה הֶעָנָן יָמִים מִסְפָּר עַל הַמִּשְׁכָּן, "and it happened that the cloud was a few days upon the sanctuary" (the same construction appears in the next verse); II Sam. 14:15, וְעַתָּה אֲשֶׁר בָּאתִי, "and now it is that I am come"; II Kings 20:20, "The rest of the acts of Hezekiah . . . . [וְאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה הַבְּרֵכָה], and that he made the pool" (not *quomodo fecerit* according to the Vulg., emphasizing the modal idea; the mere statement of the fact is all that the context demands); I Kings 14:28, "The rest of the acts of Jeroboam [וְאֲשֶׁר הֵשִׁיב אֶת־דַּמֶּשֶׂק וְאֶת־חֲמָת לִיהוּדָה], and that he restored Damascus and Hamath unto Judah" (Vulg.: *Quomodo restituit*); Koh. 3:22, אֵין טוֹב מֵאֲשֶׁר יִשְׂמַח הָאָדָם, "nothing is better than that a man rejoice" (cf. II Sam. 18:3, טוֹב כִּי; also Ps. 119:71; Ruth 2:22); Koh. 5:4, טוֹב אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִדֹּר מִשֶּׁתִּדֹּר וְלֹא תְשַׁלֵּם, "it is better that thou shouldst not vow," etc.; Koh. 7:18, טוֹב אֲשֶׁר תֹּאחֹז בָּזֶה, "it is good that thou shouldst seize hold of this"; Esther 6:2, וּנְמָצָא כָתוּב אֲשֶׁר הִגִּיד

[1] Clauses implying purpose are not included under this head.

"מָרְדְּכַי עַל", "and it was found written that Mordecai had told," etc.; Neh. 2:10, וַיֵּרַע לָהֶם רָעָה גְדֹלָה אֲשֶׁר בָּא אָדָם, "and it displeased them greatly that a man had come" (cf. Isa. 59:15, וַיֵּרַע כִּי); Zech. 8:20, עֹד אֲשֶׁר יָבֹאוּ עַמִּים, "it shall yet be that nations will come." As to II Sam. 14:26, אֲשֶׁר יְגַלֵּחַ . . . . וְהָיָה, the אשר probably introduces a temporal clause (cf. Driver, *Notes on Samuel;* Gesenius-Kautzsch also refers to Jer. 28:9 as containing an instance of a *Subjektsatz* introduced by אשר, but this is by no means certain; the clause may be simply attributive); Zech. 8:23, "Thus says Jahwe Zebaoth, In those days [אֲשֶׁר יַחֲזִיקוּ] it shall be that . . . ." Nowack regards אֲשֶׁר as introducing direct discourse. But in this case it would occupy a wrong position.

אשר *in Object Clauses*

104. אֲשֶׁר is frequently employed to introduce object clauses. When thus used, it is often preceded by the accusative sign את. Naturally, this usage is common after *verba dicendi* and *sentiendi* or equivalent expressions.

105. A. Depending on *verba dicendi*, אֲשֶׁר occurs after:

a) הִתְוַדָּה, "to confess": cf. Lev. 5:5, הִתְוַדָּה אֲשֶׁר חָטָא, "he confesses that he has sinned"; Lev. 26:40, וְהִתְוַדּוּ . . . . וְאַף, אֲשֶׁר־הָלְכוּ עִמִּי בְקֶרִי, "and they confess . . . . that they walk contrary to me."

b) אָמַר, "to say": cf. Josh. 4:7, וַאֲמַרְתֶּם לָהֶם אֲשֶׁר נִכְרְתוּ, "And ye shall say that," etc. (אֲשֶׁר may possibly be the אֲשֶׁר *recitativum*).

c) After נָגַד, "to make known": cf. Josh. 9:24, הֻגַּד לַעֲבָדֶיךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יהוה, "it was made known unto thy servants that Jahwe commanded"; here, according to a common Hebrew idiom, the passive הֻגַּד takes an *object* clause, the verb being used in an impersonal sense when the agent is indefinite (cf. the German *man*, French *on*, or the English "they" used as an indefinite subject); I Kings 19:1, וַיַּגֵּד . . . . וְאֵת כָּל־אֲשֶׁר הָרַג אֶת־כָּל־נְבִיאִים, "and he [Ahab] made known that he [Elijah] had slain all the prophets" (אֵת כָּל־ before אֲשֶׁר is probably a repetition from the preceding, and may be eliminated; but see Esther 5:11); Esther 3:4, כִּי הִגִּיד לָהֶם אֲשֶׁר־הוּא יְהוּדִי, "for he had told them that he was a Jew."

d) After סָפַר, "to relate": cf. II Kings 8:5, וַיְהִי הוּא מְסַפֵּר לַמֶּלֶךְ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־הֶחֱיָה אֶת־הַמֵּת, "and it came to pass while he was telling the king that he had restored the dead to life"; Esther 5:11, וַיְסַפֵּר לָהֶם וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר נִשְּׂאוֹ עַל הַשָּׂרִים, "and he related unto them . . . . that he had exalted him above the princes."

e) After שָׁלַח סְפָרִים, "to send letters": cf. Esther 8:11, וַיִּשְׁלַח סְפָרִים . . . . אֲשֶׁר נָתַן הַמֶּלֶךְ לַיְּהוּדִים, "And he sent letters [i.e., made known by letters] that the king had granted to the Jews," etc.

106. B. Depending on *verba sentiendi*, אֲשֶׁר occurs after:

a) יָדַע, "to know": cf. Exod. 11:7, לְמַעַן תֵּדְעוּן אֲשֶׁר יַפְלֶא יהוה בֵּין מִצְרַיִם וּבֵין יִשְׂרָאֵל, "in order that you may know that Jahwe distinguishes between the Egyptians and Israel"; Deut. 29:15, יְדַעְתֶּם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יָשַׁבְנוּ . . . . וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר עָבַרְנוּ, "Ye know that we dwelt . . . . and that we passed through"; II Sam. 11:20, הֲלֹא יְדַעְתֶּם אֵת אֲשֶׁר־יֹרוּ מֵעַל הַחוֹמָה, "did ye not know that they would shoot from the wall?"; Ezek. 20:26, לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר יֵדְעוּ אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי יהוה, "that they may know that I am Jahwe"; Job 9:5, וְלֹא יָדְעוּ אֲשֶׁר הֲפָכָם, "and they know not that he overturns them"; Koh. 7:22, יָדַע לִבֶּךָ אֲשֶׁר גַּם־אַתָּ קִלַּלְתָּ אֲחֵרִים, "thy heart knows that thou likewise hast cursed others"; Koh. 8:12, כִּי גַּם־יוֹדֵעַ אֲנִי אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה טוֹב לְיִרְאֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, "Yet surely I know that it shall be well with them that fear God"; Esther 4:11, ... יֹדְעִים אֲשֶׁר . . . . כָּל־עַבְדֵי, "All the servants of . . . . know that . . . ."; II Chron. 2:7, אֲנִי יָדַעְתִּי אֲשֶׁר עֲבָדֶיךָ יוֹדְעִים, "I know that thy servants know."

b) רָאָה, "to see": cf. I Sam. 18:15, וַיַּרְא שָׁאוּל אֲשֶׁר הוּא מַשְׂכִּיל מְאֹד, "and Saul saw that he was very successful"; I Sam. 24:11, רָאוּ עֵינֶיךָ אֵת אֲשֶׁר־נְתָנְךָ יהוה [הַיּוֹם] בְּיָדִי, "thine eyes have seen that Jahwe delivered thee into my hand"; Deut. 1:31, וּבַמִּדְבָּר אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתָ אֲשֶׁר נְשָׂאֲךָ יהוה, "and in the wilderness where thou hast seen that Jahwe bare thee."

c) שָׁמַע, "to hear": cf. Josh. 2:10, שָׁמַעְנוּ אֵת אֲשֶׁר הוֹבִישׁ יהוה אֶת־מֵי יַם־סוּף, "we heard that Jahwe dried up the waters of the Red Sea"; Josh. 5:1, וַיְהִי כְּשֹׁמַע כָּל־מַלְכֵי . . . . אֵת אֲשֶׁר־הוֹבִישׁ אֶת־מֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן, "And it came to pass when all the kings of . . . . heard that Jahwe dried up the waters of the Jordan"; I Sam. 2:22, וְשָׁמַע . . . . וְאֵת אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁכְּבוּן אֶת־הַנָּשִׁים, "and heard that they lay with the women."

d) זָכַר, "to remember": cf. II Kings 20:3, זְכָר־נָא אֵת אֲשֶׁר הִתְהַלַּכְתִּי לְפָנֶיךָ בֶּאֱמֶת, "remember that I walked before you in integrity"; cf. Isa. 38:3.

e) שָׁכַח, "to forget": Deut. 9:7, אַל תִּשְׁכַּח אֵת אֲשֶׁר־הִקְצַפְתָּ אֶת־יהוה, "do not forget that thou hast provoked Jahwe."

f) הַמּוֹפֵת, "sign": cf. I Kings 13:3, זֶה הַמּוֹפֵת אֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר יהוה, "this is a sign that Jahwe has spoken."

g) הָאוֹת, "sign": cf. Isa. 38:7, זֶה לְּךָ הָאוֹת . . . . אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה יהוה, "this is a sign unto you that Jahwe shall do," etc.

אֲשֶׁר *in Causal Clauses*

107. אֲשֶׁר may introduce clauses expressing the cause of some effect, the reason or explanation of some fact, the ground of an exhortation, the motive or justification of some mental affection, the proof of an assertion, and the like: Josh. 4:23, "On dry land Israel crossed the Jordan [אֲשֶׁר הוֹבִישׁ יהוה אֱלֹהֵיכֶם אֶת־מֵי הַיַּרְדֵּן], because Jahwe your God dried up the waters of the Jordan"; I Kings 8:33, "when thy people Israel are defeated by the enemy [אֲשֶׁר יֶחֱטְאוּ־לָךְ], because they have sinned against thee" (cf. II Chron. 6:24, כִּי); I Kings 15:5, "For David's sake did Jahwe, his God, give him a lamp in Jerusalem [אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה דָוִד אֶת־הַיָּשָׁר], because David did that which was right" (for the sake of greater emphasis the causal sentence precedes in Koh. 8:11, אֲשֶׁר אֵין־נַעֲשָׂה פִּתְגָם מַעֲשֵׂה הָרָעָה מְהֵרָה עַל־כֵּן מָלֵא לֵב", "because sentence is not executed speedily against an evil work, therefore the heart," etc.; Koh. 8:12, "אֲשֶׁר הֹטֶה עֹשֶׂה רַע מְאַת וּמַאֲרִיךְ לוֹ", "because a sinner does evil a hundred times and prolongs [his days]," etc. [a resumption and amplification of the idea in 11*a*]); Hab. 3:16, "I heard and my body trembled . . . . [אֲשֶׁר אָנוּחַ לְיוֹם צָרָה], because I must wait for the day of trouble" (so if the text is retained); Gen. 31:49, "Therefore was the name of it called . . . . Mizpah [אֲשֶׁר אָמַר יִצֶף יהוה בֵּינִי וּבֵינֶיךָ], for he said, Jahwe watch between me and thee" (giving the reason for the name); Deut. 3:24, "Thou hast begun to show thy greatness and thy strong hand [אֲשֶׁר מִי־אֵל בַּשָּׁמַיִם וּבָאָרֶץ אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה כְּמַעֲשֶׂיךָ], for what god is there in heaven or on earth who does according to thy works" (the unrivaled power of Jahwe being the natural reason for his mighty acts); I Sam. 15:15, "They have

brought them from the Amalekites [אֲשֶׁר חָמַל הָעָם עַל מֵיטַב הַצֹּאן] for [as the speaker adds by way of explanation] the people spared the best of the sheep"; I Sam. 2:23, "Why do you do these things [אֲשֶׁר אָנֹכִי שֹׁמֵעַ אֶת־דִּבְרֵיכֶם רָעִים], for I hear of your evil dealings" (so if the text is retained); II Kings 12:3, "And Jehoash did that which was right in the eyes of Jahwe all his days [אֲשֶׁר הוֹרָהוּ יְהוֹיָדָע], for Jehoiada had taught him" (R.V., "all his days wherein" is wrong; "all his days" necessarily means all his life; therefore a restrictive relative clause is impossible); Zech. 1:15, "I am greatly displeased with the nations that are at ease [אֲשֶׁר אֲנִי קָצַפְתִּי מְעָט וְהֵמָּה עָצְרוּ לְרָעָה], for I was but a little angry, but they helped for evil" (aggravated the evil); Josh. 22:31, "This day we know that Jahwe is in our midst [אֲשֶׁר לֹא מְעַלְתֶּם בַּיהוה הַמַּעַל הַזֶּה], because [inasmuch as] you have not committed this transgression against Jahwe"; in this case the אשר-clause contains the proof or evidence of the preceding assertion (cf. Luke 7:47, "Her sins, which are many, are forgiven, for she loved much); I Sam. 26:23, "And Jahwe will render unto everyone his righteousness and faithfulness [אֲשֶׁר נְתָנְךָ יהוה . . . . בְּיָדִי וְלֹא אָבִיתִי לִשְׁלֹחַ יָדִי בִּמְשִׁיחַ יהוה], inasmuch as Jahwe delivered thee into my hand and I was unwilling to put forth my hand against the anointed of Jahwe"; Isa. 19:24–25, "In that day Israel shall be the third to Assyria and Egypt, a blessing in the midst of the earth [אֲשֶׁר בֵּרְכוֹ יהוה], forasmuch as Jahwe has blessed him"; II Sam. 14:22, "Thy servant knoweth that I have found favor in thy sight . . . . [אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־דְּבַר עַבְדּוֹ], inasmuch as the king hath fulfilled the request of his servant"; Hos. 14:4, "We shall not say any more to the work of our hands, 'Our gods' [אֲשֶׁר בְּךָ יְרֻחַם יָתוֹם], for in thee the fatherless shall find mercy"; this clause differs slightly from those immediately preceding in that it expresses not a fact as such, but the certainty of a fact as the ground of the foregoing assertion; Koh. 4:9, "Two are better than one [אֲשֶׁר יֵשׁ לָהֶם שָׂכָר טוֹב], inasmuch as they have good reward"; Koh. 6:12, "For who knows what is good for man in his life . . . . which he spends as a shadow [אֲשֶׁר מִי־יָגִיד לָאָדָם מָה יִהְיֶה אַחֲרָיו], for who shall tell a man what shall be after him?"; if we change the interrogative rhetorical form of

the verse into the positive, it will appear that אֲשֶׁר may also in this case be rendered by "inasmuch as" or "seeing that," or some equivalent expression; I Sam. 20:42, "Go in peace [אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְנוּ], forasmuch as we have sworn" ("seeing that," "in view of the fact that," expressing the ground for the preceding exhortation); Zech. 11:2, "Wail, O cypress, for the cedar is fallen [אֲשֶׁר אַדִּירִים שֻׁדָּדוּ], the mighty ones are destroyed"; Neh. 2:3, "Why should not my countenance be sad [אֲשֶׁר הָעִיר בֵּית־קִבְרוֹת אֲבוֹתַי חֲרֵבָה], seeing that the city, the place of my fathers' sepulchres, lies waste" (אֲשֶׁר introducing at once the explanation and justification for the sadness); Job. 34:27 (if text is correct).

Causal Relative Clauses

108. This classification has, so far as I know, not been made in any grammatical treatise in Hebrew. This is surprising. The facts certainly warrant a classification of this kind. There are two classes of sentences expressive of cause or reason that are usually thrown together, whereas they should be kept apart. The one embraces the purely causal clauses (cf. the preceding paragraphs), and the other all such relative clauses as, besides their relative function, imply a reason or cause. It will not do to put into one class sentences of the following types: I Sam. 15:15, "And Saul said, they have brought them from the Amalekites; for [אֲשֶׁר] the people spared the best of the sheep," etc.; and I Sam. 26:16, ". . . . Ye are sons of death that [אֲשֶׁר] have not kept watch over your lord, Jahwe's anointed." So Gesenius, König, Davidson, and other grammars. In the first of these examples the אֲשֶׁר-clause is, of course, purely conjunctional; but in the second the אשר easily and naturally refers to "sons of death" as antecedent, and is therefore to be taken as introducing a relative clause. It will also be noticed that even the English (and the German) idiom will admit the use of a causal relative clause in this case. To be sure, the relative form cannot in all cases be adopted to render the Hebrew causal relative, for the reason that English (or German) does not as a rule express cause or reason in a relative clause. Consequently, the distinction between these two classes of sentences will sometimes disappear in translation, so far as the form is concerned. But even

after due allowance for this is made, a little examination of translations and commentaries will show that much needless confusion and inconsistency has arisen from the promiscuous treatment of these two types of sentence. Thus in the sentence last quoted Nowack correctly translates: "Ihr seid Kinder des Todes, die ihr nicht Acht gehabt habt," etc.; Kautzsch: "dass ihr nicht"; R.V.: "Because"; Vulg.: *quia non custodistis;* LXX: *οἱ φυλάσσοντες* (omitting the negation). II Sam. 2:5, "Blessed be ye of Jahwe [אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם הַחֶסֶד הַזֶּה]"; Nowack again: "die ihr"; Kautzsch also: "die ihr" (but why not *dass ihr*, as in the previous example?); R.V.: "that ye"; Vulg.: *qui fecistis misericordiam hanc* (why not *quia* as in the previous example?); LXX: *ὅτι ἐποιήσατε τὸ ἔλεος τοῦτο.* And so in general, one translator using a conjunction, the other a relative pronoun, in cases where the latter could be employed. I think we may set it down as a safe rule that when אֲשֶׁר, as already remarked, has an antecedent to which it can easily refer, the relative construction is to be preferred to the conjunctional. The form being identical with that of the ordinary relative clause, it is not to be assumed that such clauses were conceived in other than a relative sense by the Hebrew language. The implication of the additional idea of cause or reason was intuitively and immediately felt. Naturally, however, cases will occur where it seems impossible to decide positively in favor of the one or the other class of sentence.

109. The causal relative clause is quite common: Gen. 24:27, "And he said, Blessed be Jahwe, the God of my master Abraham [אֲשֶׁר לֹא־עָזַב חַסְדּוֹ], who [implying reason] has not forsaken his kindness," etc.; cf. the Latin: *O fortunate adulescens, qui Homerum praeconem tuae virtutis inveneris;* in this case, the Revised Version retains the relative construction, "who hath not forsaken," while in an exactly parallel case, II Sam. 2:5, it employs the conjunction "that," because the verb in the relative clause is in the second person; Gen. 24:48, "And I . . . . blessed Jahwe, the God of my master Abraham [אֲשֶׁר הִנְחַנִי בְּדֶרֶךְ אֱמֶת], who [implying reason] had led me in the right way"; Gen. 30:18, "And Leah said, God has given me my hire [אֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי שִׁפְחָתִי לְאִישִׁי], who have given my maid to my husband"; the relative in this case attaches to the suffix in "my hire"; in translation, the English idiom prefers

a causal conjunction, "because," while the German, admitting the insertion of the personal pronoun I into the clause, can easily employ the relative construction: "Die ich gegeben habe," *quae dederim;* Gen. 34:13, "And the sons of Jacob answered Shechem and Hamor with guile and spoke [with guile] [אֲשֶׁר טִמֵּא אֶת דִּינָה], who had defiled Dinah"; Gen. 34:27, "The sons of Jacob came upon the slain and plundered the city [אֲשֶׁר טִמְּאוּ אֲחוֹתָם], who had defiled their sister"; Gen. 42:21, "We are guilty [אֲשֶׁר רָאִינוּ צָרַת נַפְשׁוֹ], who [=in that we] saw the anguish of his soul" (German: "die wir gesehen haben"); Exod. 5:21, "Let Jahwe look upon you and judge [אֲשֶׁר הִבְאַשְׁתֶּם אֶת־רֵיחֵנוּ], that have made our savor to be abhorred"; Exod. 18:10, "Blessed be Jahwe [אֲשֶׁר הִצִּיל אֶתְכֶם מִיַּד מִצְרַיִם], who has delivered you out of the hand of Egypt"; here again, though plainly causal, the R.V. retains the relative construction, because the subject of the clause is in the third person, as in the first passage cited above; Num. 5:3, "That they defile not the camp [אֲשֶׁר אֲנִכִי שֹׁכֵן בְּתוֹכָם], in the midst of which I dwell"; Deut. 4:19, "Lest thou be drawn away and worship them [the host of heaven] [אֲשֶׁר חָלַק יהוה אֱלֹהֶיךָ אֹתָם לְכֹל הָעַמִּים] which Jahwe thy God has allotted unto all the peoples"; Deut. 34:10, "And there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses [אֲשֶׁר יָדְעוֹ יהוה פָּנִים אֶל־פָּנִים], whom Jahwe knew face to face"; Josh. 5:6, "until all the nation, the men of war . . . . were consumed [אֲשֶׁר לֹא־שָׁמְעוּ בְּקוֹל יהוה], who did not obey the voice of Jahwe"; I Sam. 26:16, "Sons of death are you [אֲשֶׁר לֹא שְׁמַרְתֶּם עַל־אֲדוֹנֵיכֶם], who have not kept watch over your lord"; II Sam. 2:5, "Blessed be you of Jahwe [אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם הַחֶסֶד הַזֶּה], who have done this kindness"; II Sam. 2:6; "I will requite you this kindness [אֲשֶׁר עֲשִׂיתֶם הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה], who have done this thing"; II Sam. 6:20, "How honorably did David conduct himself to-day [אֲשֶׁר נִגְלָה הַיּוֹם לְעֵינֵי], who uncovered himself before the eyes [of the handmaids of his servants]"; the scorn expressed in the exclamatory sentence is substantiated by the relative clause, the sense being that the king disgraced himself, since he uncovered himself, etc. (Vulg.: *discooperiens se*, expressing reason); I Kings 3:19, "And the son of this woman died in the night [אֲשֶׁר שָׁכְבָה עָלָיו]"; it is, perhaps, impossible to decide here between

the relative and conjunctional constructions, though I prefer the former; assuming the clause to be relative, there is still some uncertainty as to the antecedent; it may be "son" or "woman"; in the one case, the translation would run, "upon whom [אֲשֶׁר . . . . עָלָיו] she lay," in the other, "who lay upon him"; at all events, the clause expresses cause; nor is there any valid reason against its being a relative clause; I Kings 8:39, "Render unto every one according to all his ways [אֲשֶׁר תֵּדַע אֶת־לְבָבוֹ כִּי אַתָּה יָדַעְתָּ אֶת־לְבַב], who knowest his heart; for thou alone knowest the heart [of all the children of men]"; this is to my mind the only correct rendering of the clause; R.V.: "whose heart thou knowest" would make the clause rather restrictive, which is contrary to the sense, since Jahwe, of course, knows *all* hearts; Kautzsch, Kittel, Keil: "Wie du sein Herz kennst" involves a useless redundancy, since the same idea is already expressed in "according to his ways"; the same objection applies to the LXX and Vulg.: *καθὼς ἂν γνῷς τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ, sicut videris cor eius;* it is simply a causal relative clause connecting with "thou" implied in the imperative "render"; I Kings 8:23–24, "O Jahwe . . . . there is no God like thee in heaven above and on earth beneath . . . . [אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַרְתָּ לְעַבְדְּךָ דָוִד אָבִי אֵת אֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ לוֹ], who hast kept unto thy servant David that which thou didst promise him"; here versions and commentaries generally adopt the relative construction, though the sentence is exactly the same as others where the אשר is treated as a conjunction; I Kings 15:13, "And also Maacah, his mother, he removed from being queen [אֲשֶׁר עָשְׂתָה מִפְלֶצֶת לַאֲשֵׁרָה], who had made an abominable image unto Ashera"; II Kings 17:4, "And the king of Assyria found treason in Hosea [אֲשֶׁר שָׁלַח מַלְאָכִים אֶל־סוֹא מֶלֶךְ מִצְרַיִם], who had sent messengers to So king of Egypt"; Isa. 30:10, "For it is a rebellious people, lying children [vs. 9] . . . . [אֲשֶׁר אָמְרוּ לָרֹאִים לֹא תֵרָאוּ], that say to the seers, See not"; Isa. 49:7, "Kings shall see and rise, princes and they shall worship because of Jahwe [אֲשֶׁר נֶאֱמָן], who is faithful"; Jer. 5:22, "Will ye not fear me [אֲשֶׁר שַׂמְתִּי חוֹל גְּבוּל לַיָּם], who have placed the sand as a boundary to the sea?"; even in English we here distinctly feel that the relative clause implies a reason; Jer. 13:25, "This is thy lot, the portion measured unto thee from me, saith Jahwe [אֲשֶׁר שָׁכַחְתְּ אוֹתִי], who hast for-

gotten me"; Jer. 16:13, "I will hurl you from this land . . . . and there you shall serve other gods [אֲשֶׁר לֹא אֶתֵּן לָכֶם חֲנִינָה], who shall show you no favor"; the fact that אֲשֶׁר is here very far removed from the antecedent in הֶטַלְתִּי ("I will hurl") is no decisive objection against the relative construction, though אֲשֶׁר may in this instance be a conjunction; there are, as remarked, some cases where it is impossible to pronounce definitely as to the function of the particle; Jer. 20:17, "Let him hear a cry of mourning and an alarm at noonday [אֲשֶׁר לֹא מוֹתַתְנִי מֵרָחֶם], who slew me not from the womb" (Vulg.: *Qui non me interfecit*); Ezek. 6:9, "And your escaped ones shall remember me among the nations . . . . [אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּרְתִּי אֶת־לִבָּם הַזּוֹנֶה], whose [referring to those that escape] lewd heart I shall break"; there is no reason here for canceling אֲשֶׁר (*SBOT*); possibly שָׁבַרְתִּי should take the place of the form in the text; Ezek. 6:11, "Smite with thy hand and stamp with thy foot and cry, Alas! because of the abominations of the house of Israel [אֲשֶׁר בַּחֶרֶב . . . . יִפֹּלוּ], which shall fall by the sword . . . . "; here again there is no reason whatever for the excision of אֲשֶׁר; we have here simply a relative clause containing the ground for the preceding exhortation; Ezek. 14:5, "In order to seize Israel by the heart [אֲשֶׁר נָזְרוּ מֵעָלַי], which has turned away from me"; Ezek. 16:52, "Thou also, bear thy own shame [אֲשֶׁר פִּלַּלְתְּ לַאֲחוֹתֵךְ], who hast given judgment for thy sister"; Ezek. 39:29, "I shall not hide my face from them any more [אֲשֶׁר שָׁפַכְתִּי אֶת־רוּחִי עַל־בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל], who have [shall have] poured out my spirit upon the house of Israel"; overlooking the real nature of this relative clause as implying a reason, Toy, Cornill, Grätz, and others suggest יַעַן אֲשֶׁר as a necessary emendation, because the LXX reads *ἀνθ' οὗ*; but it will be seen that the clause, as it stands, is perfectly regular, requiring no textual manipulation whatever; Hag. 1:9, "Because of my house [אֲשֶׁר הוּא חָרֵב], which lieth waste" (Kautzsch: "Um meines Hauses willen, weil es in Trümmern liegt"); Ps. 66:20, "Blessed be Jahwe [אֲשֶׁר לֹא הֵסִיר תְּפִלָּתִי], who has not turned away my prayer"; Ps. 71:19, "Thy righteousness, O God, is very high [אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ גְדֹלוֹת], who hast done great things"; Job 5:3–5, "I have seen the foolish taking root; but suddenly I cursed his habitation . . . . [אֲשֶׁר קִצִּירוֹ רָעֵב יֹאכֵל],

whose harvest the hungry eateth up"; Job 9:13–15, " . . . . The helpers of Rahab stoop under him, how much less should I answer him [vs. 14] . . . . [אֲשֶׁר אִם צַדַּקְתִּי לֹא אֶעֱנֶה], whom, though I were righteous, I could not answer"; or, reading אֶעָנֶה, "who, though . . . . , shall receive no answer"; Job 9:16–17, "If I should call and he would answer me, I would not believe that he would listen to my voice [אֲשֶׁר בִּשְׂעָרָה יְשׁוּפֵנִי], who overwhelms me with a tempest" (a very obvious example of causal relative); Job 37:16–17, "Knowest thou the poisings of the thick cloud, the wonders of Him who is perfect in knowledge [אֲשֶׁר בְּגָדֶיךָ חַמִּים], [thou] whose garments are hot?"; Koh. 8:13, "It shall not be well with the wicked and he shall not prolong his days like a shadow [אֲשֶׁר אֵינֶנּוּ יָרֵא מִלִּפְנֵי אֱלֹהִים], who does not fear God"; Dan. 8:9, "To us belongs confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, to our fathers [אֲשֶׁר חָטָאנוּ לְךָ], who have sinned against thee"; I Chron. 21:8, "And David said unto God, I have sinned greatly [אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה], who have done this thing."

Final Clauses[1]

110. Final or purpose clauses are not infrequently introduced by אֲשֶׁר. They are of two kinds, viz., *pure* and *complementary*. In the former, the verb of the main sentence contains a complete thought, while, in the latter, it requires the dependent clause as its necessary complement.

111. A. *Pure final clauses.*—Gen. 11:7, "Let us confound their language [אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁמְעוּ], that they do not understand" (LXX: *ἵνα μή*); Exod. 20:26, "Thou shalt not go up by steps upon my altar [אֲשֶׁר לֹא תִגָּלֶה עֶרְוָתְךָ עָלָיו], that thy nakedness be not revealed thereon"; Deut. 4:10, "Assemble the people and I will make them hear my words [אֲשֶׁר יִלְמְדוּן לְיִרְאָה אֹתִי], that they may learn to fear me"; Deut. 4:40, "And thou shalt keep his statutes . . . . [אֲשֶׁר יִיטַב לְךָ], that it may be well with thee" (cf. לְמַעַן in the same verse); Deut. 6:3, "Hear, Israel, and observe . . . . [אֲשֶׁר יִיטַב לְךָ וַאֲשֶׁר תִּרְבּוּן מְאֹד], that it may be well

[1] *BDB* treats final and result clauses under one head: "It [אֲשֶׁר] is resolvable into 'so that.'" But "so that" may be final, expressing aim, or it may be consecutive, expressing result. Gen. 11:7 and 22:14 certainly do not represent a single type of clause. The former clearly denotes aim or purpose, the latter an actual consequence or result.

with thee and that you may increase exceedingly"; Deut. 32:46, "Set your heart unto all the words which I testify unto you this day [אֲשֶׁר תְּצַוֻּם אֶת־בְּנֵיכֶם]"; this clause is probably best taken as a relative, "*which* ye shall command" (against Gesenius-Kautzsch, Davidson), since the action of the main clause does not look forward to another action as its aim; in other words, it is not a means to an end, but an end in itself; the relative clause is here very loosely attached to the preceding; Josh. 3:7: "I will begin to make thee great in the eyes of all Israel . . . . [אֲשֶׁר יֵדְעוּן כִּי כַאֲשֶׁר], that they may know that," etc.; Ruth 3:11, "Shall I not seek rest for thee [אֲשֶׁר יִיטַב לָךְ], that it may be well with thee?"; Koh. 7:21, "Take no heed unto all words that are spoken [אֲשֶׁר לֹא תִשְׁמַע אֶת־עַבְדְּךָ מְקַלְלֶךָ], lest thou hear thy servant curse thee"; Neh. 2:7, "Let letters be given unto me to the governors beyond the river [אֲשֶׁר יַעֲבִירוּנִי], that they allow me to pass"; Neh. 2:8, "And a letter unto Asaph [אֲשֶׁר יִתֵּן לִי עֵצִים], that he may give me timber"; II Chron. 1:11, " . . . . but hast asked wisdom and knowledge for thyself [אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁפּוֹת עַמִּי], that thou mayest judge my people"; Jer. 42:14, "We shall go to Egypt [אֲשֶׁר לֹא נִרְאֶה מִלְחָמָה], that we may not see war," or "where we shall not see war"; either is possible, if the present text be retained.

112. B. *Complementary final clauses.*—These clauses are found after verbs of will or purpose, or equivalent expressions. They are substantive clauses and may represent a subject or an object.

a) Complementary final clauses as subject: Esther 1:19, "If it please the king, let it be written [אֲשֶׁר לֹא תָבוֹא וַשְׁתִּי לִפְנֵי הַמֶּלֶךְ]; that Vashti come not in the presence of the king"; Neh. 13:1, "And it was found written therein [אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָבוֹא עַמֹּנִי בִּקְהַל הָאֱלֹהִים . . . .], that an Ammonite should not enter into the congregation of God." These are the only two instances that I have found in which the final clause represents the subject. It is not impossible, however, that the Hebrew *usus loquendi* felt these clauses to be in an objective relation to the governing verb, according to the well-known Hebrew usage that a verb in the passive may take an object; cf. Gen. 4:18, וַיִּוָּלֵד לַחֲנוֹךְ אֶת־עִירָד.

b) Complementary final clauses as object: Gen. 24:3, "And I will cause thee to swear . . . . [אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִקַּח אִשָּׁה לִבְנִי], that thou

wilt not take a wife for my son," etc.; I Kings 22:16, "How often shall I cause thee to swear [אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תְדַבֵּר אֵלַי רַק־אֱמֶת בְּשֵׁם יהוה] that thou speak to me only the truth in the name of Jahwe?"; Esther 2:10, ". . . . Mordecai had commanded her [אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תַגִּיד] that she should not make it known"; Dan. 1:8, "And Daniel purposed in his heart [אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִתְגָּאַל], that he would not defile himself"; Neh. 2:5, "If it please the king . . . [אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁלָחֵנִי], that thou wouldst send me"; the governing verb is אֲבַקֵּשׁ, "I would request," to be supplied from the preceding verse; Neh. 7:65, וַיֹּאמֶר לָהֶם אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֹאכְלוּ, "he told them that they should not eat" (cf. Ezra 2:63); Neh. 8:14, "And they found written in the law that Jahwe had commanded by Moses [אֲשֶׁר יֵשְׁבוּ בְנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל] that the Israelites should dwell [in tents]"; Neh. 8:15, וְאֲשֶׁר יַשְׁמִיעוּ, "and that they should proclaim" (continuation of vs. 14); Neh. 10:31, "They [the rest of the people, priests, Levites, porters, etc.] entered into a curse and into an oath [vs. 30] [אֲשֶׁר לֹא נִתֵּן בְּנֹתֵינוּ לְעַמֵּי הָאָרֶץ] that we would not give our daughters to the nations of the land"; Neh. 13:19, וְאֹמְרָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִפָּתְחוּם, "and I said that they should not open them [the gates]"; Neh. 13:22, וְאֹמְרָה לַלְוִיִּם אֲשֶׁר יִהְיוּ מִטַּהֲרִים, "that they should be purifying themselves"; II Chron. 18:15 = 1 Kings 22:16 (cf. *supra*).

NOTE.—One cannot fail to notice that most of these examples are found in late books, especially Nehemiah. It is noteworthy also that these clauses never take the accusative sign את before the אֲשֶׁר.

Final Relative Clauses

113. אֲשֶׁר occurs in a few instances in relative clauses of purpose (cf. the Latin). Exod. 32:1, 23, "Make us gods [אֲשֶׁר יֵלְכוּ לְפָנֵינוּ] to go before us" (in order that they may go, etc.); (cf. Vulg.: *quid nos praecedant* [with subjv. of purpose]; Kautzsch: "schaffe uns einen Gott, der vor uns einherziehe"); Num. 27:17: "Let Jahwe appoint a man over the congregation [vs. 16] [אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא לִפְנֵיהֶם], to go out before them" (R.V.: "who may go out before them"; Vulg.: *qui . . . . possit exire;* Kautzsch: "der an ihrer Spitze ausziehe").

Consecutive or Result Clauses

114. אֲשֶׁר introduces clauses denoting result or consequence: Gen. 13:16, "I will make thy seed like the dust of the earth [אֲשֶׁר אִם יוּכַל אִישׁ לִמְנוֹת אֶת־עֲפַר הָאָרֶץ גַּם־זַרְעֲךָ יִמָּנֶה], so that if any man can number the dust of the earth, then may thy seed also be numbered"; Gen. 22:14, "And Abraham called the name of the place Jahwe-jireh [אֲשֶׁר יֵאָמֵר הַיּוֹם בְּהַר יְהוָה יֵרָאֶה], so that it is said to-day" (the rest obscure); Deut. 28:27, "Jahwe will smite thee with the boil . . . . [אֲשֶׁר לֹא תוּכַל הֵרָפֵא], so that thou canst not be healed" (Vulg.: *ita ut curari nequeas;* LXX: *ὥστε μὴ δύνασθαί σε ἰαθῆναι*; R.V., however: "whereof"); I Kings 3:12, "I have given thee a wise and understanding heart [אֲשֶׁר כָּמוֹךָ לֹא־הָיָה לְפָנֶיךָ וְאַחֲרֶיךָ לֹא־יָקוּם כָּמוֹךָ], so that there has been none like thee before thee," etc.; I Kings 3:13, "I have given thee . . . . both riches and honor [אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיָה כָמוֹךָ אִישׁ בַּמְּלָכִים כָּל־יָמֶיךָ], so that there has been none like thee among the kings"; translating הָיָה as a perfect, "all thy days" must be rejected; Kittel in the *Handk.* takes הָיָה as a future perfect; in this case, "all thy days" could be retained, but it would then unduly affect the greatness of the promise; II Kings 9:37, "And the body of Jezebel shall be as dung upon the face of the field in the portion of Jezreel [אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֹאמְרוּ זֹאת אִיזֶבֶל], so that they shall not say, This is Jezebel"; Isa. 65:16, "He will call his servants by another name [אֲשֶׁר הַמִּתְבָּרֵךְ בָּאָרֶץ יִתְבָּרֵךְ בֵּאלֹהֵי אָמֵן], so that he who blesses himself in the earth shall bless himself in the God Amen"; Jer. 19:11, " . . . . so will I break this people and this city, as one breaketh a potter's vessel [אֲשֶׁר לֹא יוּכָל לְהֵרָפֵא עוֹד], that it cannot be made whole again"; the clause may, however, be taken in a relative sense, "which cannot," etc.; König regards it as consecutive; Mal. 3:19, " . . . . the day that cometh shall burn them up, says Jahwe [אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעֲזֹב לָהֶם שֹׁרֶשׁ וְעָנָף], that it shall not leave them root or branch"; Ps. 95:11, "Forty years long was I grieved with this generation and said, It is a people that do err in their heart [10] . . . . [אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי אִם יָבוֹאוּן אֶל־מְנוּחָתִי], so that I sware that they should not enter into my rest"; it is possible here to take אֲשֶׁר simply in the sense of "concerning whom" or "as to whom" (R.V.: "wherefore";

Kautzsch: "Und so schwur ich"; Vulg.: *ut iuravi;* LXX: ὡς ὤμοσα); Esther 9:1, וְנַהֲפוֹךְ הוּא אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁלְטוּ הַיְּהוּדִים, "and the matter was reversed so that the Jews ruled [over those that hated them]."

115. There is one instance of complementary consecutive clause in the Old Testament: Ezek. 36:27, וְעָשִׂיתִי אֵת־אֲשֶׁר בְּחֻקַּי תֵּלֵכוּ, "and I cause you to walk in my statutes" (Vulg.: *Faciam ut in praeceptis meis ambuletis*).

Consecutive Relative Clauses, or Relative Clauses of Characteristic

116. This type of clause is quite common in Hebrew, although it has been disregarded by the grammars. It is used, as will be seen from the following example, to express a characteristic or quality of an indefinite antecedent (as a rule): Gen. 20:9, מַעֲשִׂים אֲשֶׁר לֹא יֵעָשׂוּ עָשִׂיתָ עִמָּדִי, "thou hast done deeds unto me that ought not to be done"; Gen. 41:38, "And Pharaoh said, Can we find such a one as this [אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר רוּחַ אֱלֹהִים בּוֹ], a man in whom the spirit of God is?" (Vulg.: *qui spiritu Dei plenus sit?*); Exod. 5:2, ... מִי יהוה אֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁמַע בְּקֹלוֹ, "who is Jahwe, whose voice I should obey?" (="that I should obey his voice") (Vulg.: *ut audiam vocem eius*); Exod. 9:18, "Behold, to-morrow about this time I will cause it to rain a very grievous hail . . . . [אֲשֶׁר לֹא הָיָה כָמֹהוּ בְּמִצְרַיִם], such as has not been in Egypt" (Vulg.: *qualis non fuit;* cf. Exod. 9:24); Exod. 11:6, "And there shall be a great cry throughout all the land of Egypt [אֲשֶׁר כָּמֹהוּ לֹא נִהְיָתָה], such as there has not been"; Exod. 34:10, "I will do marvels [אֲשֶׁר לֹא־נִבְרְאוּ בְּכָל־הָאָרֶץ], such as have not been wrought in all the earth"; Deut. 3:24, " . . . . what god is there in heaven or in earth [אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה כְמַעֲשֶׂיךָ] that can do according to thy deeds?" (Vulg.: *qui possit facere opera tua;* Kautzsch: "der solche Werke verrichten könnte?"); Deut. 28:49–50, "Jahwe will bring a nation against thee from afar . . . . [גּוֹי אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִשְׁמַע לְשֹׁנוֹ גּוֹי עַז פָּנִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשָּׂא פָנִים]", a nation whose tongue thou shalt not understand, a nation of fierce countenance that shall not regard the person of the old," etc. (Vulg.: *cuius linguam intelligere non possis; gentem, quae non deferat seni, nec misereatur parvuli*); I Kings 3:8, עַם־רַב אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמָּנֶה וְלֹא יִסָּפֵר מֵרֹב

numbered nor counted for multitude (Kautzsch: "dass es vor Menge nicht zu zählen noch zu berechnen ist"); Isa. 7:17, "Jahwe shall bring upon thee and upon thy people and upon thy father's house [יָמִים אֲשֶׁר לֹא־בָאוּ לְמִיּוֹם] days that [such as] have not come" (Kautzsch: "Tage, dergleichen nicht gekommen sind"); Jer. 49:19, וּמִי־זֶה רֹעֶה אֲשֶׁר יַעֲמֹד לְפָנָי, "Who is the shepherd that shall stand before me?" (Vulg.: *Quis est iste pastor, qui resistat vultui meo?* Kautzsch: "wo wäre der Hirte, der vor mir Stand halten könnte?"; cf. Jer. 50:44); Dan. 12:1, וְהָיְתָה עֵת צָרָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא נִהְיְתָה מִהְיוֹת", "And there shall be a time of trouble such as there never has been since there was [a nation, etc.]" (Vulg.: *veniet tempus, quale non fuit*); Neh. 5:2–4, וְיֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר אֹמְרִים, "There were those who said" (Vulg.: *erant, qui dicerent*); the expression occurs at the beginning of three successive verses; it corresponds exactly with the Latin relative clause of characteristic after general expressions of existence or non-existence; I Chron. 17:21, "And who is like thy people Israel, a unique people in the earth [אֲשֶׁר הָלַךְ הָאֱלֹהִים לִפְדּוֹת לוֹ עָם], that God went to redeem unto himself for a people"; II Chron. 1:12, וְכָבוֹד אֶתֶּן־לְךָ אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָיָה כֵן לַמְּלָכִים", "And honor I will give thee such as none of the kings had that were before thee"; the כֵּן here takes the place of the ordinary כָּמוֹהוּ, but it might be dispensed with altogether without altering the sense; II Chron. 2:5, וּמִי אֲנִי אֲשֶׁר אֶבְנֶה־לּוֹ בַיִת, "and who am I that I should build him a house?"

Conditional Clauses

117. The particle אֲשֶׁר may introduce conditional clauses: Exod. 21:13, וְאֲשֶׁר לֹא זָדָה . . . . וְשַׁמְתִּי לְךָ מָקוֹם, "and if he does not act presumptuously, then I will appoint you a place"; since this verse continues and *modifies* the thought of the preceding verse (מַכֵּה אִישׁ . . . . יוּמָת), I prefer to take אֲשֶׁר as a conditional conjunction rather than as an indefinite relative pronoun ("whoso," Driver, *Heb. Tenses*, 123) (cf. Kautzsch: "Wenn er [i.e., the מַכֵּה] es aber nicht vorsätzlich gethan"); Lev. 4:22, אֲשֶׁר נָשִׂיא יֶחֱטָא, "if a ruler sinneth"; Num. 5:29, אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׂטֶה אִשָּׁה תַּחַת אִישָׁהּ, "if a wife [being] under her husband turn aside"; hardly *welches*

Weib (Erwald), assuming an attraction of the antecedent; Num. 9:20, 21, יֵשׁ אֲשֶׁר is not conditional (against Friedrich); the sense is simply *it happened that;* Deut. 11:27, "The blessing [אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁמְעוּ אֶל־מִצְוֹת יהוה], if you obey the commands of Jahwe" (cf. vs. 28, אִם לֹא תִשְׁמְעוּ); Deut. 18:22, אֲשֶׁר יְדַבֵּר הַנָּבִיא, "if a prophet speaks"; Baentsch renders: "Was der Prophet redet (ohne dass es geschieht und eintrifft, das ist ein Wort," etc.); Josh. 4:21, אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁאָלוּן בְּנֵיכֶם, "if your children ask" (cf. 4:6, כִּי־יִשְׁאָלוּן); I Kings 8:31, אֵת אֲשֶׁר יֶחֱטָא אִישׁ, "if a man sin" (lit. "as to the case when a man sins") (cf. II Chron. 6:22, אִם יֶחֱטָא).

Conditional Relative Clauses[1]

118. A relative clause in Hebrew (as in other languages) often involves the idea of condition. This is the case when the clause does not refer to any specific individual or thing, which it describes, but to a whole class of persons or things supposable under any given circumstances. Such clause is not declarative, but merely assumptive, and hence it performs essentially the same function as conditionals strictly so called. This becomes especially apparent in cases where, by a kind of *anacoluthon*, there is no formal agreement or connection between the main and the relative clauses. Such looseness of construction is conditioned by the indefinite nature of the relative clauses. Cf. Lev. 22:18–19, אִישׁ אִישׁ . . . . אֲשֶׁר יַקְרִיב קָרְבָּנוֹ לְרִצֹנְכֶם תָּמִים זָכָר . . . ., "Any man . . . . who brings his offering—[ye shall offer such] that ye may be accepted," etc.; Isa. 55:1, וַאֲשֶׁר אֵין לוֹ כֶּסֶף לְכוּ, "whoever hath no money—come ye"; Zech. 14:17, וְהָיָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יַעֲלֶה . . . . וְלֹא עֲלֵיהֶם יִהְיֶה הַגֶּשֶׁם, "And it shall be that whoever does not go up . . . . upon them shall be no rain."

119. Syntactically, conditional relative clauses naturally follow the rules of hypothetical periods. Thus the relative clause (or, as one might say, the relative protasis) most frequently takes the imperfect as the tense of incompleted and therefore indeterminate action; cf. Gen. 17:14, וְעָרֵל זָכָר אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִמּוֹל אֶת־בְּשַׂר . . . . וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא, "And the uncircumcised male who is not circumcised . . . . that soul shall be cut off" (Vulg.: *circumcisa non*

[1] Cf. Friedrich, *Hebr. Conditionalsätze*, §§ 88 ff.

fuerit); Gen. 24:14, "And the girl [אֲשֶׁר אֹמַר אֵלֶיהָ . . . . וְאָמְרָה], to whom I shall say [let down thy pitcher] and she say"; this is equivalent to: "If the girl to whom I shall say, Let down thy pitcher, say . . . ." (cf. vs. 43, אָמַרְתִּי, where the tone proves that וְאָמְרָה in vs. 14 has וְ consecutive,[1] introducing the apodosis); Gen. 44:9, אֲשֶׁר יִמָּצֵא אִתּוֹ . . . . וָמֵת, "with whom it shall be found [he] shall die"; Exod. 30:33, אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִרְקַח כָּמֹהוּ . . . . וְנִכְרַת מֵעַמָּיו, "whoever compoundeth anything like it . . . . shall be cut off from his people (LXX: ὃς ἂν ποιήσῃ; Vulg.: *Homo quicumque tale composuerit*); Lev. 7:20, וְהַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר־תֹּאכַל . . . . וְנִכְרְתָה, "and the soul that eateth . . . . shall be cut off" (LXX: ἥτις ἐὰν φάγῃ; Vulg.: *quae ederit*); Lev. 17:3, אִישׁ אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁחָט . . . . וְנִכְרַת (vs. 4), "whoever killeth . . . . shall be cut off" (cf. Lev. 17:8, 13; 18:5, "Keep my statutes [אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה אֹתָם הָאָדָם וָחַי בָּהֶם], which, if a man do, he shall live thereby" (cf. Latin: *philosophia, cui qui pareat, omne tempus aetatis sine molestia possit degere*); Lev. 20:6; Num. 15:30, הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה . . . . וְנִכְרְתָה; Deut. 17:12, הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־יַעֲשֶׂה . . . . וּמֵת הָאִישׁ הַהוּא; Deut. 18:20, הַנָּבִיא אֲשֶׁר יָזִיד . . . . וַאֲשֶׁר יְדַבֵּר . . . . וּמֵת; Judg. 1:12, אֲשֶׁר יַכֶּה אֶת־קִרְיַת סֵפֶר . . . . וְנָתַתִּי לוֹ (LXX: ὃς ἂν πατάξῃ . . . . δώσω αὐτῷ); Isa. 56:4, "For thus says Jahwe concerning the eunuchs [אֲשֶׁר יִשְׁמְרוּ אֶת־שַׁבְּתוֹתַי . . . . וְנָתַתִּי לָהֶם]"; Jer. 27:11, ... וְהַגּוֹי אֲשֶׁר יָבִיא אֶת־צַוָּארוֹ בְּעֹל מֶלֶךְ בָּבֶל . . . . וְהִנַּחְתִּיו (LXX: καὶ τὸ ἔθνος ὃ ἐὰν εἰσαγάγῃ . . . . καταλείψω); Mic. 3:5, וַאֲשֶׁר לֹא יִתֵּן עַל־פִּיהֶם וְקִדְּשׁוּ עָלָיו מִלְחָמָה, "And whoever does not give into their mouths, they consecrate war against him."

120. It will be noticed that in all the examples thus far cited the relative clause with the imperfect is followed by the perfect and *waw consecutive* in the main sentence. More frequently, however, the latter also takes the imperfect; cf. Gen. 31:32, עִמּ אֲשֶׁר תִּמְצָא אֶת־אֱלֹהֶיךָ לֹא יִחְיֶה, "with whomsoever thou findest thy gods, [he] shall not live" (LXX: Παρ' ᾧ ἂν εὕρῃς . . . . οὐ ζήσεται; Vulg.: *apud quemcumque inveneris*); Gen. 44:10, אֲשֶׁר יִמָּצֵא אִתּוֹ יִהְיֶה לִי עָבֶד, "with whomsoever it is found [he] shall be my servant" (LXX: Παρ' ᾧ ἂν εὑρεθῇ . . . .; Vulg.: *apud quemcumque fuerit inventum*); cf. the preceding verse, where instead

[1] Cf. Driver, *Hebrew Tenses*, p. 131.

of imperfect in the *apodosis* we have the perfect with *waw consecutive;* Lev. 7:19, הַבָּשָׂר אֲשֶׁר יִגַּע בְּכָל־טָמֵא לֹא יֵאָכֵל (LXX: *καὶ κρέα ὅσα ἐὰν ἅψηται . . . . οὐ βρωθήσεται*; Vulg.: *caro, quae tetigerit*); Lev. 15:5, וְאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יִגַּע בְּמִשְׁכָּבוֹ יְכַבֵּס בְּגָדָיו (LXX: *καὶ ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἐὰν ἅψηται . . . . πλυνεῖ τὰ ἱμάτια*; Vulg.: *Si quis hominum tetigerit . . . . lavabit*); Lev. 20:2, אִישׁ אִישׁ . . . . אֲשֶׁר . . . . מִזַּרְעוֹ יִתֵּן (LXX: *Ἐάν τις . . . . ὃς ἂν δῷ*; cf. Lev. 20:9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, and other examples in the same chapter); Lev. 21:10; Num. 5:10, אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־יִתֵּן לַכֹּהֵן לוֹ יִהְיֶה (LXX: *καὶ ἀνὴρ ὃς ἐὰν δῷ ἱερεῖ, αὐτῷ ἔσται*); Num. 22:6, אֲשֶׁר תָּאֹר יוֹאָר (LXX: *οὓς ἂν καταράσῃ*); Deut. 18:19, אָנֹכִי . . . . וְהָיָה הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִשְׁמַע אֶדְרֹשׁ מֵעִמּוֹ (LXX: *ὃς ἐὰν μὴ ἀκούσῃ . . . . ἐκδικήσω ἐξ αὐτοῦ*); Judg. 6:31, אֲשֶׁר יָרִיב לוֹ יוּמַת (LXX: *ὃς ἐὰν δικάσηται*); I Sam. 17:25, הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יַכֶּנּוּ יַעְשִׁירֶנּוּ הַמֶּלֶךְ, "whoever slays him, the king will make him rich"; Isa. 60:12, הַגּוֹי וְהַמַּמְלָכָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעַבְדוּךְ יֹאבֵדוּ, "the nation and kingdom which shall not serve thee shall perish"; Jer. 27:8, וְהָיָה הַגּוֹי וְהַמַּמְלָכָה אֲשֶׁר לֹא יַעַבְדוּ אֹתוֹ . . . . אֶפְקֹד . . . . , "and the nation and kingdom which shall not serve him . . . . I will punish . . . ."; Ezek. 1:12, אֶל אֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה שָׁמָּה הָרוּחַ לָלֶכֶת יֵלֵכוּ, "wherever the spirit went [imperfect of repeated action], they went" (cf. Ezek. 1:20); Koh. 5:3, אֶת אֲשֶׁר תִּדֹּר שַׁלֵּם, "whatsoever you vow, fulfil" (LXX: *ὅσα ἐὰν εὔξῃ ἀπόδος*; Vulg.: *Quodcumque voveris redde*). In Zech. 14:17, even the imperfect has the *waw consecutive:* אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יַעֲלֶה וְלֹא עֲלֵיהֶם יִהְיֶה הַגָּשֶׁם, "whoever shall not go up, upon them shall be no rain."

121. The conditional relative clause sometimes takes the perfect, in which case the implied condition is conceived by the imagination as realized; cf. Num. 9:13, הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר . . . . חָדַל לַעֲשׂוֹת הַפֶּסַח . . . . וְנִכְרְתָה, "The man who forbeareth to keep the passover, [*that soul*] shall be cut off" (LXX [as in other examples where the imperfect is employed]: *ὃς ἐὰν . . . . ὑστερήσῃ*); Isa. 50:10, אֲשֶׁר הָלַךְ חֲשֵׁכִים וְאֵין נֹגַהּ לוֹ יִבְטַח בְּשֵׁם יהוה, "he that walketh in darkness and hath no light, let him trust in the name of Jahwe."

122. The relative clause may also take the participle; cf. I Sam. 11:7, אֲשֶׁר אֵינֶנּוּ יֹצֵא . . . . כֹּה יֵעָשֶׂה, "whoever does not go forth . . . . so shall it be done [unto his oxen]." Here the emphasis is not primarily on a possible future *action*, but on a possible

mental attitude with reference to Saul's command. The sense is "whoever shows no inclination to go forth."

123. The clause may also be a purely nominal sentence. In this case there is no verb at all. Cf. Jer. 23:28, הַנָּבִיא אֲשֶׁר . . . . אִתּוֹ חֲלוֹם יְסַפֵּר, "the prophet who has a dream, let him tell it"; Jer. 15:2, אֲשֶׁר לַמָּוֶת לַמָּוֶת (cf. Jer. 43:11; Num. 9:13); Job 39:30, וּבַאֲשֶׁר חֲלָלִים שָׁמּ הוּא, "and wherever the slain are, there is he" (LXX: *οὗ ἂν ὦσι τεθνεῶτες*; Vulg.: *Ubicumque cadaver fuerit, statim adest*).

124. Sometimes instead of the perfect with *waw* or the imperfect, the bare perfect is employed in the main clause; cf. Ezek. 14:4, אִישׁ אִישׁ . . . . אֲשֶׁר יַעֲלֶה אֶת־גִּלּוּלָיו . . . . אֲנִי יהוה נַעֲנֵיתִי לוֹ, "Every man who causes his idols to come up [into his heart] . . . . I, Jahwe will answer him." The perfect here expresses the certainty and immediateness of the result; cf. also Ezek. 14:7; Gen. 24:14, וְהָיָה הַנַּעַר אֲשֶׁר אֹמַר . . . . אֹתָהּ הֹכַחְתָּ, "And the girl to whom I shall say . . . . her thou hast appointed."

125. If the idea of generalization is to receive greater emphasis than is already implied in the indefinite relative clause as such, the antecedent or the relative particle (according as the clause is dependent or independent) is often preceded by כל. As to the form, the use of the imperfect in both members of the sentence represents the prevailing type. Out of the thirty-seven instances that follow, eighteen are of this character; cf. Exod. 20:24, בְּכָל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר אַזְכִּיר אֶת־שְׁמִי אָבוֹא אֵלֶיךָ, "In every place where I shall record my name I will come to you"; Lev. 6:20, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר יִגַּע בִּבְשָׂרָהּ יִקְדָּשׁ, "whoever touches the flesh thereof shall be holy"; Lev. 15:20, וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁכַּב עָלָיו . . . . יִטְמָא, "everything that she lieth upon shall be unclean"; Lev. 15:26, כָּל־הַכְּלִי אֲשֶׁר תֵּשֵׁב עָלָיו טָמֵא יִהְיֶה, "every vessel that she sitteth upon shall be unclean"; Num. 19:16, וְכֹל אֲשֶׁר־יִגַּע . . . . יִטְמָא, "whosoever touches shall be unclean"; Num. 19:22, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר בּוֹ יִגַּע הַטָּמֵא יִטְמָא, "whosoever the unclean person touches shall be unclean"; Num. 22:17, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־תֹּאמַר אֵלַי אֶעֱשֶׂה, "whatsoever thou sayest I will do"; Deut. 11:24, כָּל־הַמָּקוֹם אֲשֶׁר תִּדְרֹךְ כַּף . . . . לָכֶם יִהְיֶה, "every place the sole of your feet shall tread upon shall be yours"; Deut. 15:19, כָּל־הַבְּכוֹר אֲשֶׁר יִוָּלֵד . . . . תַּקְדִּישׁ, "every firstling

that is born thou shalt sanctify"; Deut. 19:15, "One witness [לֹא יָקוּם] against a man [בְּכָל־חֵטְא אֲשֶׁר יֶחֱטָא] in any sin that he has sinned"; I Sam. 14:47, בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר־יִפְנֶה יַרְשִׁיעַ, "whithersoever he turned he was victorious"; so, if instead of יַרְשִׁיעַ we read (cf. LXX: ἐσώζετο) יִוָּשַׁע, "he was saved" or "victorious"; II Sam. 15:35, תַּגִּיד . . . . כָּל־הַדָּבָר אֲשֶׁר תִּשְׁמַע, "whatsoever thou shalt hear, thou shalt tell"; II Kings 10:19, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־יִפָּקֵד לֹא יִחְיֶה, "whosoever shall be missing shall not live"; Joel 3:5, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר יִקְרָא בְּשֵׁם יהוה יִמָּלֵט, "whosoever shall call upon the name of Jahwe shall escape"; Ps. 1:3, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה יַצְלִיחַ, "whatsoever he doeth, he carries out successfully"; Prov. 17:9, אֶל־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יִפְנֶה יַשְׂכִּיל, "whithersoever he turneth he is successful"; Prov. 21:1, עַל־כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יַחְפֹּץ יַטֶּנּוּ, "whithersoever he wills he turns it"; II Chron. 15:13, יוּמָת . . . . כֹּל אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִדְרֹשׁ, "whosoever should not seek [Jahwe] . . . . should be put to death."

126. Quite frequently also the *apodosis* is introduced by the perfect and *waw consecutive;* cf. Exod. 9:19, כָּל־הָאָדָם . . . . אֲשֶׁר יִמָּצֵא בַשָּׂדֶה . . . . וְיָרַד עֲלֵיהֶם הַבָּרָד וָמֵת, "every man [and beast] that shall be found in the field . . . . the hail shall come down upon them"; Lev. 7:27, כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר־תֹּאכַל . . . . וְנִכְרְתָה, "whosoever eateth . . . . shall be cut off"; Lev. 17:15, כָּל־נֶפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תֹּאכַל . . . . וְכִבֵּס, "whosoever eateth shall wash [his clothes]"; Lev. 18:29, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה . . . . וְנִכְרְתוּ הַנְּפָשׁוֹת הָעֹשֹׂת, "whosoever does [these abominations]—the souls that do them shall be cut off"; note here the plural in the apodosis due to the broad indefiniteness of the relative clause; Lev. 22:3, כָּל־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־יִקְרַב . . . . וְנִכְרְתָה הַנֶּפֶשׁ הַהִוא, "every man that approaches . . . . that soul shall be cut off"; observe here the change of subject in the apodosis resulting again from the wide and general application of the relative clause; Lev. 23:29, כָּל־הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר לֹא־תִעֹנֶּה . . . . וְנִכְרְתָה; Lev. 23:30, כָּל־הַנֶּפֶשׁ אֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂה . . . . וְהַאֲבַדְתִּי; II Chron. 19:10, וְכָל־רִיב אֲשֶׁר־יָבוֹא עֲלֵיכֶם וְהִזְהַרְתֶּם, "and every controversy that shall come to you [from your brethren, etc.], you shall warn them."

127. The relative clause may be a purely nominal sentence; cf. Lev. 21:18, כָּל־אִישׁ אֲשֶׁר בּוֹ מוּם לֹא יִקְרַב, "whatsoever man

has a blemish shall not approach"; Lev. 22:20, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר־בּוֹ מוּם לֹא תַקְרִיבוּ, "whosoever has a blemish you shall not cause to approach"; Num. 19:14, כָּל־אֲשֶׁר בָּאֹהֶל יִטְמָא, "whosoever is in the tent shall be unclean." Again, the apodosis may have the bare perfect for sake of greater emphasis. Cf. Josh. 1:3, כָּל־מָקוֹם אֲשֶׁר תִּדְרֹךְ כַּף . . . . בּוֹ לָכֶם נְתַתִּיו, "every place whereon the sole [of your feet] shall tread, to you have I given it"; Judg. 2:15, בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר יָצְאוּ יַד יהוה הַיְתָה־בָם, "whithersoever they went out the hand of Jahwe was against them."

128. The relative clause appears also with the perfect; cf. Num. 30:10, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־אָסְרָה עַל־נַפְשׁוֹ יָקוּם, "everything wherewith she hath bound her soul shall stand"; I Chron. 18:6, וַיּוֹשַׁע יהוה לְדָוִיד בְּכֹל אֲשֶׁר הָלַךְ; cf. I Chron. 18:13.

129. The main clause or apodosis may be a nominal sentence; cf. Josh. 2:19, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר יֵצֵא מִדַּלְתֵי בֵיתֶךָ . . . . דָּמוֹ בְרֹאשׁוֹ, "whosoever goes forth from the doors of thy house, his blood is upon him."

130. Both members may be nominal; cf. Gen. 30:33, כֹּל אֲשֶׁר־אֵינֶנּוּ נָקֹד וְטָלוּא . . . . גָּנוּב הוּא, "every one that is not speckled or spotted . . . . shall be [counted as] stolen"; Num. 19:15, כֹּל כְּלִי פָּתוּחַ אֲשֶׁר אֵין צָמִיד פָּתִיל עָלָיו טָמֵא הוּא, "every open vessel, which hath no cover bound upon it, is unclean."

131. Finally, the main clause may have the imperfect with the *waw consecutive;* cf. II Sam. 15:2, וַיְהִי כָל־הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר־יִהְיֶה־לּוֹ רִיב לָבוֹא . . . . וַיִּקְרָא אַבְשָׁלוֹם, "and if any man had a suit . . . . then Absalom would call to him," etc.

132. Another mode of generalizing a relative clause and thus rendering it virtually conditional is to prefix the antecedent or the particle with the interrogative מִי (מָה) used indefinitely. How far the latter in these instances may have retained its interrogative force it is impossible to tell. This question, however, does not affect the general sense of the clause. Cf. Exod. 32:33, "And Jahwe said unto Moses [מִי אֲשֶׁר חָטָא־לִי אֶמְחֶנּוּ מִסִּפְרִי], Whosoever has sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book" (lit. "who [is it] that has sinned against me?—him will I blot out"; LXX: *εἴ τις ἡμάρτηκεν ἐνώπιόν μου, ἐξαλείψω* . . . . ; Vulg.: *qui peccaverit* . . . . *delebo*); II Sam. 20:11, "And there stood by him

one of Joab's young men and said [מִי אֲשֶׁר חָפֵץ בִּיוֹאָב וּמִי אֲשֶׁר לְדָוִד אַחֲרֵי יוֹאָב], whosoever has delight in Joab and whosoever is for David, let him follow Joab"; Eccles. 9:4, כִּי־מִי אֲשֶׁר יְחֻבַּר אֶל כָּל־הַחַיִּים יֵשׁ בִּטָּחוֹן, "For whosoever is united with all the living—there is hope"; as in other cases, referred to above, there is here no formal agreement between the main sentence and the relative clause; Deut. 20:5, מִי הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר בָּנָה . . . . יֵלֵךְ, "whosoever has built [a house] . . . . may go" (lit., "who [is the] man that has built a house," etc.; both LXX and Vulg. retain the interrogative construction here: *Τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος . . . . , Quis est homo, qui aedificavit;* Kautzsch: "Jedermann unter euch, der ein neues Haus gebaut hat . . . . mag abtreten"; cf. also vss. 6 and 7); Judg. 10:18, מִי הָאִישׁ אֲשֶׁר יָחֵל . . . . יִהְיֶה לְרֹאשׁ, "whosoever shall begin [to fight] shall be head"; in this case the Vulg. abandons the interrogative construction: *Qui primus coeperit dimicare . . . . erit dux;* LXX: *Τίς ὁ ἀνὴρ ὅστις ἂν ἄρξεται . . . . καὶ ἔσται εἰς ἄρχοντα*, carrying on the question to the end of the verse.

133. A participle may take the place of the relative clause; cf. I Sam. 11:12, מִי הָאֹמֵר שָׁאוּל יִמְלֹךְ עָלֵינוּ תְּנוּ, "whoever says . . . . deliver [the men, etc.]"; Deut. 20:8; Judg. 7:3. Of course, an adjective or noun may also be employed; cf. Ps. 34:13–14, מִי הָאִישׁ הַחָפֵץ חַיִּים . . . . נְצֹר לְשׁוֹנְךָ מֵרָע, "who is the man that desireth life . . . . keep thy tongue from evil [and thy lips from speaking guile]"; logically, the question is equivalent to a conditional clause, of which the imperative forms the apodosis (cf. Baethgen: "Wenn du . . . . begehrst . . . . so bewahre," u.s.w.); Exod. 24:14, מִי־בַעַל דְּבָרִים יִגַּשׁ אֲלֵיהֶם; Isa. 50:8, מִי־בַעַל מִשְׁפָּטִי יִגַּשׁ אֵלָי.

134. מִי alone is sometimes equivalent to מִי אֲשֶׁר; cf. II Sam. 20:11, מִי אֲשֶׁר־לְדָוִד אַחֲרֵי יוֹאָב, "whosoever is for David, let him follow Joab"; and Exod. 32:26, מִי לַיהוָה אֵלַי, "whosoever is for Jahwe, let him come to me." It is noteworthy also that the indefinite מִי is sometimes indistinguishable from the indefinite אֲשֶׁר; cf. Isa. 55:1, אֲשֶׁר אֵין לוֹ כֶסֶף לְכוּ, "whoever has no silver—come ye"; and Exod. 32:24, לְמִי זָהָב הִתְפָּרָקוּ, "whoever has gold—strip it off."

Explicative Clauses

135. The particle אשר quite frequently introduces a clause which serves to specialize or define a preceding idea stated indefinitely. The latter may either be a single word or a clause. These explicative or epexegetic clauses have never received due recognition. Most grammars ignore them entirely. To a certain extent, however, they are implicitly recognized by versions and commentaries, though there is lack of agreement and uniformity in their treatment. This arises chiefly from the fact that, owing to a misapprehension of the true nature of the clause, an explicative אֲשֶׁר is sometimes regarded as a simple relative particle.

136. I shall first cite those instances in which the epexegetic use of אֲשֶׁר is plain and unmistakable; cf. Ezek. 20:32, וְהָעֹלָה עַל־רוּחֲכֶם הָיוֹ לֹא תִהְיֶה אֲשֶׁר אַתֶּם אֹמְרִים נִהְיֶה כַגּוֹיִם, "And that which cometh up in your mind shall not be at all [namely] that ye are saying, We will be as the heathen"; it is plain at the first glance that the אֲשֶׁר-clause specifies the indefinite הָעֹלָה; Koh. 7:29, רְאֵה־זֶה מָצָאתִי אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה הָאֱלֹהִים אֶת־הָאָדָם יָשָׁר, "Behold this have I found [namely] that God made man upright"; Koh. 8:14, "There is [הֶבֶל] a vanity which is done upon earth [אֲשֶׁר יֵשׁ צַדִּיקִים], that there are righteous unto whom it happeneth according to the work of the wicked"; Koh. 9:1, אֶת־כָּל־זֶה נָתַתִּי אֶל־לִבִּי אֲשֶׁר צַדִּיקִים", "All this I laid to heart, that the righteous," etc.; Neh. 2:17, "And I said unto them, Ye see [הָרָעָה] the evil case we are in . . . . [אֲשֶׁר יְרוּשָׁלִַם חֲרֵבָה וּשְׁעָרֶיהָ"], that Jerusalem is desolate and its gates broken down"; II Chron. 35:20, אַחֲרֵי כָל־זֹאת אֲשֶׁר הֵכִין יֹאשִׁיָּהוּ", "After all this [namely], that Josiah had restored the temple," etc.; אֲשֶׁר is here not used temporally in the sense of "when." So R.V. after all this: "when." Kittel: "Nach alledem, als." The אֲשֶׁר-clause is an explanatory apposition to כָּל־זֹאת. Vulg. simplifies by: *Postquam instauraverat.* Finally, I should insert here Koh. 8:15, "And I commended mirth [אֶת־הַשִּׂמְחָה אֲשֶׁר אֵין־טוֹב לָאָדָם תַּחַת הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ כִּי אִם־"], that there is nothing better for a man under the sun than to eat and drink." I think this is preferable to "because." The clause defines wherein mirth consists rather than gives the reason for a final judgment on the supreme good.

137. In the following examples the אֲשֶׁר is sometimes, erroneously to my mind, regarded as a relative particle: Exod. 18:9, "And Jethro rejoiced [עַל כָּל־הַטּוֹבָה אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה יהוה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר הִצִּילוֹ מִיַּד מִצְרָיִם] at the good which Jahwe did unto Israel, that he rescued them from the hand of the Egyptians." Here A.V. renders "whom he delivered," because אֲשֶׁר . . . . וֹ may apparently refer to "Israel" as its antecedent. However, it is the preceding indefinite הַטּוֹבָה with its clause that calls for more definite specification, not "Israel." While it is true that there is ultimately little or no difference in the sense, we feel that the relative construction in shifting the emphasis from "the good" to the recipient of the same materially weakens the force of the sentence. Therefore, R.V., with truer insight into the thought, renders "in that he delivered them." So also Baentsch, Kautzsch. LXX: *ὅτι ἐξείλατο* (causal); Vulg.: *eo, quod eruisset,* "in that he had delivered." A parallel passage is I Sam. 24:19, וְאַתָּה הִגַּדְתָּ אֵת אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ אִתִּי טוֹבָה אֲשֶׁר סִגַּרְנִי יהוה בְּיָדֶךָ וְלֹא הֲרַגְתָּנִי, "And thou hast made known [according to a conjectural reading "made great"] the good which thou hast done by me, that Jahwe delivered me into thy hand and thou didst not slay me." Here again the good consisted in this that Jahwe delivered him into his (David's) hand and yet he (David) did not slay him (Saul). So far as formal grammar is concerned אֲשֶׁר סִגַּרְנִי might be rendered "whom he delivered," making it refer to אִתִּי as antecedent. But this would be awkward and unnatural, especially in view of the intervening טוֹבָה. Other examples are: Deut. 25:18, "Remember [אֵת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה לְךָ עֲמָלֵק . . . .] what Amalek did unto thee . . . . that he met thee," etc. (LXX: *πῶς ἀνέστη σοι* . . . . ; Vulg.: *quomodo occurrit;* English versions: "How he met thee"; Kautzsch: "Wie er dir begegnete"; Steuernagel in the *Handkommentar:* "der dir begegnete" [incorrect]; again it must be insisted that the clause is manifestly intended to specify the indefinite "what Amalek did"); Deut. 28:20, "Jahwe will send upon you the curse . . . . [מִפְּנֵי רֹעַ מַעַלְלֶיךָ . . . . אֲשֶׁר עֲזַבְתָּנִי], because of the evil of your deeds, that you have forsaken me"; Steuernagel correctly renders: "wegen der Bosheit deiner Taten, dass du mich verlassen hast"; he adds in a note, "die [*sc.* die Bosheit] darin besteht, dass du mich

verlassen hast," which gives the sense exactly; freely rendered, the clause means simply "in having forsaken me" (LXX: *διότι ἐγκατέλιπές με*; Vulg.: *in quibus reliquisti me;* so also the English versions: "whereby"); Deut. 11:4, "what he did unto the army of Egypt, unto their horses . . . . [אֲשֶׁר הֵצִיף אֶת־מֵי יַם־סוּף עַל־פְּנֵיהֶם], that he caused the waters of the Red Sea to overflow them" (LXX: *ὡς ἐπέκλυσε*; Vulg.: *quomodo;* Steuernagel incorrectly adopts the relative construction); Judg. 9:17, אֲשֶׁר נִלְחַם אָבִי עֲלֵיכֶם וַיִּשְׁלֵךְ אֶת־נַפְשׁוֹ מִנֶּגֶד וַיַּצֵּל אֶתְכֶם מִיַּד מִדְיָן; this clause attaches to the indefinite statement of the preceding verse, וְאִם־כְּגְמוּל יָדָיו עָשִׂיתֶם לוֹ, "and if ye have done according to the deserving of his hands, namely, that my father fought for you and cast his life before him [i.e., risked his life] and rescued you from the hand of Midian [and ye have arisen against my father's house this day, etc.]," the apodosis closing this long and involved period being added in vs. 19, ... "then rejoice." In the light of what has already been said in connection with other examples, the clause in question obviously stands in an appositional explanatory relation to the statement "according to the deserving of his hands." Both the A.V. and R.V. translate "for my father . . . . ," treating vss. 17, 18 as a long parenthesis. Similarly Nowack: "denn, für euch hat mein Vater gekämpft"; Kautzsch: "ihr, für die mein Vater gekämpft hat," making the אֲשֶׁר go back to the second person of the preceding verbs; Keil: "da doch"; Vulg.: *qui pugnavit pro vobis* (omitting אָבִי); LXX: *ὡς παρετάξατο* [*ἐπολέμησεν*] *ὁ πατήρ μου ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν*; König, III, 385, n.: "Wenn gemäss der Leistung seiner Hand ihr thatet: dass mein Vater," etc., which is correct. Further instances of the epexegetic use are: I Sam. 15:2, "I will punish [אֵת אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה עֲמָלֵק לְיִשְׂרָאֵל אֲשֶׁר שָׂם לוֹ] what Amalek did unto Israel, that he set himself against him" (cf. Deut. 25:18); I Sam. 28:9, "Thou knowest [אֵת אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה שָׁאוּל אֲשֶׁר הִכְרִית אֶת־הָאֹבוֹת] what Saul has done, that he has cut off the necromancers"; here Nowack renders "der dir Totenbeschwörer ausgerottet hat," treating the clause as relative; in the preceding example, however, I Sam. 15:2, he renders, "indem er sich ihm in den Weg stellte," an unnecessary inconsistency, since there also he might have referred אֲשֶׁר to Amalek and rendered, "der sich ihm in den Weg stellte"; however,

both clauses are not relative, but explicative; Jer. 1:16, "Because of their wickedness [אֲשֶׁר עָזְבוּנִי], that they have forsaken me [in having forsaken me]" (cf. Deut. 28:20; Keil: "das Böse besteht in dem Abfall vom Herrn," which gives the exact sense); Jer. 32:40, "I shall make an everlasting covenant with them [אֲשֶׁר לֹא אָשִׁוּב מֵאַחֲרֵיהֶם] that I will not turn away from following them"; Ps. 31:8, "I will be glad and rejoice [בְּחַסְדֶּךָ אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתָ עָנְיִי] in thy favor, that thou hast looked upon my affliction"; R.V. "for" is wrong; the clause explains the general term "favor." Deut. 11:6 is perhaps best placed in the category of explicative clauses: "What he did unto Dathan and Abiram, the sons of Eliab, the son of Reuben [אֲשֶׁר פָּצְתָה הָאָרֶץ אֶת־פִּיהָ וַתִּבְלַע אֹתָם] [namely], that the earth opened her mouth and devoured them." As in previous instances, the clause specifies the indefinite preceding statement "what he did." The syntactic relation is, however, less strict than ordinarily, for the reason that the clause has its own subject (הָאָרֶץ). Logically, however, it is Jahwe who causes the earth to open her mouth, so that it may properly be said that the clause is cast in essentially the same mold as others of this class. By way of an interesting contrast, I insert here Baumann's analysis of this verse: "Die Söhne Eliabs, sie [אֲשֶׁר being a demonstrative apposition to "the sons of Eliab"] (von denen auszusagen ist:) die Erde sperrte ihren Rachen auf und verschlang sie," etc.[1] Finally, Judg. 9:38 and Isa. 50:1 are best treated as explicative clauses.

138. In conclusion, it may be remarked that explicative clauses sometimes appear asyndetically, that is to say, without the use of the mediating אֲשֶׁר; cf. Ruth 4:7, וְזֹאת לְפָנִים בְּיִשְׂרָאֵל עַל הַגְּאֻלָּה וְהַתְּמוּרָה לְקַיֵּם כָּל־דָּבָר שָׁלַף אִישׁ נַעֲלוֹ . . . . , "This was formerly [the custom] in Israel concerning redeeming . . . . [that] a man cast off his shoe," etc.; Koh. 5:12, יֵשׁ רָעָה חֹלָה רָאִיתִי תַּחַת הַשָּׁמֶשׁ עֹשֶׁר שָׁמוּר לְבְעָלָיו לְרָעָתוֹ, "There is a grievous evil that I have seen under the sun, [that] riches are kept by the owner thereof to his hurt" (R.V.: namely, "riches kept," etc.) (cf. also Koh. 5:15; 10:5–6); Job 10:14, אִם־חָטָאתִי [vs. 13] יָדַעְתִּי כִּי זֹאת עִמָּךְ, "I know that this was in thy mind [that] if I should sin. . . . ."

[1] *Hebräische Relativsätze*, p. 30.

Concessive Clauses

139. Simple אֲשֶׁר never introduces a concessive clause. It may, however, perform this function when coupled with גַּם. Cf. Neh. 3:35, גַּם אֲשֶׁר־הֵם בּוֹנִים אִם יַעֲלֶה שׁוּעָל וּפָרַץ חוֹמַת אַבְנֵיהֶם, "Even though they build, if a jackal should go up, he shall tear down their stone wall." It seems preferable to take אֲשֶׁר as a conjunction, though the relative construction is most generally adopted. If we render "even that which they build" (R.V., Kautzsch, Siegfried: "was sie auch immer bauen mögen), it would be more natural to expect a pronominal resumptive in the main clause than חוֹמַת אַבְנֵיהֶם. Cf. König, III, 415*E:* "Gesetzt auch, dass sie bauen"; Vulg.: *Aedificent: si ascenderit vulpes* (with the subjunctive of indifference: "Let them build"). This is the only instance of the kind to be found in the Old Testament. Friedrich (*Hebr. Conditionalsätze*, p. 60) refers to Koh. 8:12 as a second example, in which, as he says, the גַּם is separated from אֲשֶׁר. But, as his citation shows, he has overlooked the כִּי which stands in immediate proximity to גַּם. גַּם כִּי is, in fact, the more usual form of expression; cf. Ps. 23:4, גַּם כִּי־אֵלֵךְ; Prov. 22:6, גַּם כִּי יַזְקִין; Hos. 8:10; 9:16; Isa. 1:15. Occasionally the position of the two particles is reversed, כִּי גַּם; cf. Koh. 4:14; 8:12.

Concessive Relative Clauses

140. There are a few instances in the Old Testament of relative clauses with a concessive connotation; cf. Jer. 32:35, "And they built high places of Baal . . . . to cause their sons to pass through the fire unto Molech ["אֲשֶׁר לֹא צִוִּיתִים] which I did not command them." The clause is the logical equivalent of: "Although [despite the fact that] I did not command them." There is a concessive or adversative idea implied. Cf. also Jer. 7:31; 19:5; 29:23; Deut. 17:3. Jonah 4:10, "Thou hast had compassion on the gourd [אֲשֶׁר לֹא עָמַלְתָּ בּוֹ וְלֹא גִדַּלְתּוֹ], for which thou didst not labor," etc. Again the sense is, "although thou didst not," etc. Cf. Kautzsch: "obschon du dich nicht um ihn bemüht hast"; Esther 4:16, "And thus [referring to what has preceded] I will go in to the king [אֲשֶׁר לֹא־כַדָּת], which is not according to the law," i.e., notwithstanding it is contrary to the law. In this case, most versions

abandon the relative construction in favor of a purely concessive expression: Siegfried: "obwohl es gegen das Gesetz ist"; Kautzsch: "obwohl dies dem Gesetz zuwiderläuft"; Luther: "wider das Gebot"; Vulg., freely: *contra legem faciens;* LXX: *παρὰ τὸν νόμον*; but A.V., R.V.: "which is not according to the law." In Ps. 139:15 the case is not so clear, although the concessive construction is possible and yields an excellent sense: "My bone was not hidden from thee [אֲשֶׁר עֻשֵּׂיתִי בַסֵּתֶר], who was made in secret," i.e., "although I was made in secret." The relative particle refers back to the suffix in עַצְמִי ("my bone"). The clause is often classed as temporal; English versions: "when"; Kautzsch: *als;* Luther: *da;* Delitzsch: *der ich* (relative); Vulg. and LXX: *fecisti*, *ἐποίησας*, with verb in second person, and taking אֲשֶׁר as object; Targ.: *qui factus sum.*

Temporal Clauses

141. It is very questionable whether אֲשֶׁר is as frequently employed to introduce pure temporal clauses (with no designation of time preceding[1]) as has been supposed. Most of the examples cited by *GHW* are by no means decisive. They are the following: Gen. 40:13, "Thou wilt put the cup into his hand [כַּמִּשְׁפָּט הָרִאשׁוֹן אֲשֶׁר הָיִיתָ מַשְׁקֵהוּ], after the former manner *when* thou wast his cupbearer"; this may be correct, and is at any rate sufficiently accurate as concerning the general sense; but if מִשְׁפָּט expresses more than simply a modal idea, if it denotes the *condition* or *office* formerly held by the cupbearer, a sense which seems to me legitimate,[2] then the following clause is attributive, and the אֲשֶׁר as the connecting medium may be circumscribed somewhat as follows: "which answers to the following description" (cf. Vulg.: *juxta officium tuum*); Num. 33:1, "These are the journeys of the Israelites [אֲשֶׁר יָצְאוּ מֵאֶרֶץ מִצְרַיִם לְצִבְאֹתָם], when [R.V.] they went forth out of the land of Egypt by their hosts"; here the temporal idea is inappropriate; the clause evidently refers to journeys and indicates the various stages in the migration to Canaan (Baentsch: "in denen sie ausgezogen sind"; so also Kautzsch; Vulg.: *qui egressi sunt,*

[1] Clauses in which אֲשֶׁר follows a time designation have already been considered; cf. § 82.

[2] Cf. Judg. 13:12; II Kings 1:7.

referring to the Israelites; LXX: ὡς ἐξῆλθον); I Kings 8:9, "There was nothing in the ark save the two tables of stone which Moses placed there at Horeb" [אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת יהוה עִמּ־בְּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל]; here the local idea is at least just as probable and more so, perhaps, than the temporal: "where Moses made a covenant (R.V. [margin]: "where"; so also König, III, 387*g*, and Syr.; Vulg.: *quando;* adopting the reading of LXX, the clause is purely relative); Jer. 29:19, "Because they have not hearkened unto my words [אֲשֶׁר שִׁלַּחְתִּי אֲלֵיהֶם אֶת־עֲבָדַי], who sent unto them my servants [the prophets]"; this is the most natural construction, the relative attaching to the suffix in "my words"; Ps. 139:13 and II Chron. 35:20 have already been discussed. With the possible exception, therefore, of Gen. 40:13, not one of the passages mentioned by *GHW* is unquestionably temporal, while some of them are plainly of another type. Equally uncertain are three other passages, in which the אֲשֶׁר is sometimes regarded as doing the duty of a temporal conjunction. The first, Ps. 41:9, "An evil disease has befallen [is cast upon] him" [וַאֲשֶׁר שָׁכַב לֹא־יוֹסִיף לָקוּם], König (III, 387*g*) regards as a temporal clause; so also A.V., R.V.: "Now that he lieth, he shall rise no more"; Baethgen and Kautzsch: "Wer sich einmal gelegt hat" (indefinite relative pronoun); so also Aq.: ὃς ἂν κοιμηθῇ; this is the simplest and most natural rendering. The clause would seem to be of a proverbial character. The second passage is Ps. 69:5, אֲשֶׁר לֹא־גָזַלְתִּי אַז אָשִׁיב. König takes אֲשֶׁר in the sense of *dann, wann,* with אַז as correlative (III, 387*g*). But "when I have not taken away, then I must restore" seems an unnatural form of expression; possibly the text is corrupt and instead of אַז we should read אֲנִי; the verse would then run: "what . . . . taken away, I must restore"; but the LXX reads אַז (ἃ οὐκ ἥρπασα τότε ἀπετίννυον); so also Vulg.: *quae non rapui nunc exsolvebam.* Baethgen explains: "Damals als die unverdiente Feindschaft den Sänger traf, galt von ihm das Sprichwort, dass er zurückgeben musste, was er nicht geraubt hatte." However the אַז may be disposed of, the אשר-clause is doubtless relative. The third uncertain passage, Gen. 30:38, "He placed the rods which he had peeled in the watering troughs [אֲשֶׁר תָּבֹאנָה הַצֹּאן לִשְׁתּוֹת] where the flocks came to drink." So R.V., which, in view of what

we have seen concerning the use of אֲשֶׁר in temporal clauses, is to be preferred to "when." The local conception has been generally preferred (Kautzsch, Delitzsch, Gunkel, Syr.), while König and Wynkoop favor the temporal.

Modal Clauses

142. Gesenius-Kautzsch cites a number of passages in which אֲשֶׁר is said to take the place of כַּאֲשֶׁר as a *comparative conjunction* (cf. § 161). Let us look at these passages. In Exod. 10:6 the אֲשֶׁר is declared to be the equivalent of *quemadmodum*. We have already discussed this verse; cf. § 87, where it is stated that the אשר-clause refers to the entire preceding statement concerning the plague, and this accords best with the sense. In Exod. 14:13, כִּי אֲשֶׁר רְאִיתֶם אֶת־מִצְרַיִם הַיּוֹם לֹא תֹסִפוּ לִרְאֹתָם, "for as ye see the Egyptians to-day ye shall see them no more," אֲשֶׁר is hardly a conjunction equivalent to *quemadmodum* or *ὃν τρόπον* (LXX). Rather is it the equivalent of *quales*, "such as." The clause expresses *state* or *condition*, not *manner*. The sense is that this is the last time that the Egyptians shall appear in the character of vigorous, menacing warriors. The rendering of Vulg., *quos nunc videtis*, and Keil, "die Ägypter welche ihr heute seht" (with attraction of the antecedent), though grammatically possible, is devoid of force. In Exod. 34:18, "Seven days shalt thou eat unleavened bread [אֲשֶׁר צִוִּיתִי], as I commanded" (Vulg.: *sicut praecepi;* LXX: *καθάπερ*), some MSS read כַּאֲשֶׁר. The modal idea may be accepted here. Nevertheless, it is possible to regard אֲשֶׁר as a relative particle with the entire preceding sentence as antecedent; cf. examples where the particle is thus employed, § 83. These are the examples instanced by Gesenius-Kautzsch; they are also adopted by König. It will be seen that they are indecisive as establishing the comparative-modal use of the particle. For sake of completeness I shall briefly discuss a few other similar cases: Isa. 54:9, כִּי מֵי נֹחַ זֹאת לִי אֲשֶׁר נִשְׁבַּעְתִּי מֵעֲבֹר מֵי־נֹחַ עוֹד עַל־הָאָרֶץ כֵּן, "For the waters of Noah is this unto me; as I have sworn that the waters of Noah shall no more go over the earth, so [have I sworn, etc.]"; this the usual rendering. Here it is to be remarked in the first place that there is some manuscript and

abundant versional authority (Sym., Theod., Syr., Targ., Vulg.) for reading כִּימֵי, "as the days," instead of כִּי מֵי. But if this reading, which is decidedly preferable, be adopted, the following אֲשֶׁר may very easily and naturally be taken in the sense of "when." *Vide supra* for this common usage of the particle after designations of time. "Like the days of Noah is this unto me when I sware," etc. As for the following כֵּן, it cannot be objected that this demands a correlative; cf. Isa. 55:9, where no correlative expression precedes. Consequently, there is no necessity whatever for assuming that אשר does the duty of כַּאֲשֶׁר in our passage. In Jer. 33:22, אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִסָּפֵר צְבָא הַשָּׁמַיִם . . . . כֵּן אַרְבֶּה אֶת־זֶרַע דָּוִד, "as the host of heaven cannot be numbered, so will I multiply the seed of David," if the text be accepted as it stands, we have here an undoubled comparative-modal use of אֲשֶׁר. But it is doubtful if אֲשֶׁר is original. At any rate, the rendering of Syr., Theod., Targ., Vulg. seems to favor an original כַּאֲשֶׁר, though it must not be overlooked that, granted the אֲשֶׁר be original, these versions might still have used a distinctively comparative mode of expression for the sake of clearness. But the general *usus loquendi* seems to decide against the originality of אֲשֶׁר. Jer. 48:8 is still less decisive. The אֲשֶׁר may be causal, or it may be simply the relative particle. Giesebrecht cancels as dittography. Our conclusion, therefore, is that a strictly modal use of אֲשֶׁר in comparative sentences cannot be shown to exist in Old Testament Hebrew.

143. There are, however, a few passages in which אֲשֶׁר performs the function of a conjunctive modal adverb; cf. I Kings 14:19, "The rest of the acts of Jeroboam [אֲשֶׁר נִלְחַם וַאֲשֶׁר מָלַךְ], how he warred and how he reigned [behold, they are written, etc.]." It is plain here that אֲשֶׁר must have a conjunctive-adverbial force expressing manner. By this is not meant, of course, that any such meaning was inherent in the particle as such. It is only the sense and the context that decide the peculiar force of אֲשֶׁר in any given case. In the present instance it is evident that a mere statement of fact, i.e., *that* the king made war and particularly *that* he reigned, would be wholly futile; cf. Vulg.: *quomodo pugnaverit et quomodo regnaverit.* The case is different in II Kings 14:15, "the rest of the acts of Joash which he did and his power [וַאֲשֶׁר נִלְחַם עִם אֲמַצְיָהוּ"],

and how he fought with Amaziah. . . . ." Here the אֲשֶׁר may simply mean *that*, introducing the statement that Joash waged war with Amaziah. Vulg., omitting the ו, joins אֲשֶׁר with *might* and renders: *fortitudo eius, qua pugnavit;* cf. vs. 28, גְּבוּרָתוֹ אֲשֶׁר נִלְחָם. But even here the clause is hardly relative, modifying גְּבוּרָתוֹ, but adverbial, as in the first example. Gen. 30:29, יָדַעְתָּ אֵת אֲשֶׁר עָבַדְתִּיךָ, "thou knowest how I served thee," expresses manner and not mere fact; cf. § 77; Vulg.: *quomodo servierim tibi.* But אֵת אֲשֶׁר may also be equivalent to an inner or cognate accusative.

אֲשֶׁר *Recitativum*

144. Sometimes the particle אֲשֶׁר serves to introduce direct discourse. It then takes the place of כִּי, which is more ordinarily employed. This usage is very rare. Even among the few instances generally pointed out, some admit of another construction: cf. I Sam. 15:20, "And Saul said unto Samuel [אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְתִּי בְּקֹל יהוה], I have obeyed the voice of Jahwe." The אֲשֶׁר is here, in my opinion, nothing else than an introductory particle. Syr. leaves it unexpressed; Nowack: "אֲשֶׁר dient zur Einführung der directen Rede." More generally, however, it is regarded as an asseverative particle. R.V.: "Yea, I have obeyed . . . . "; Vulg.: *Immo audivi.* Budde (*SBOT*), unwilling to admit this use of אֲשֶׁר, conjectures אָכֵן. We can safely say that so weak and indefinite a particle as אֲשֶׁר can never have been employed to lend force and emphasis to a statement. Nor is there any such idea required by the context. Other instances are: II Sam. 1:4, "He said [אֲשֶׁר נָס הָעָם], The people fled"; so generally (LXX: εἶπεν ὅτι ἔφυγεν [ὅτι is ambiguous]; Vulg., Kautzsch, Nowack, Driver, *et al.*); König (III, 374*c*) remarks that the clause may be a "Referat des Historikers"; while this is possible, it is hardly probable; the vividness of the narrative favors direct discourse; II Sam. 2:4, וַיַּגִּדוּ לְדָוִד לֵאמֹר אַנְשֵׁי יַבֵּשׁ גִּלְעָד אֲשֶׁר קָבְרוּ אֶת־שָׁאוּל, "And they told David saying, The men of Jabesh-Gilead were they that buried Saul"; so R.V., which I hold to be correct. This leaves the text as it is, and is grammatically possible. It is generally assumed that אֲשֶׁר is misplaced, its proper position being supposedly after לֵאמֹר. But this would be the only instance in the Old Testament

where לֵאמֹר, which, as is well known, is employed again and again to introduce direct discourse, would be followed by an unnecessarily redundant אֲשֶׁר. It is thought that the LXX λέγοντες ὅτι favors the view of a misplacement of אֲשֶׁר. But this rendering proves nothing. ὅτι could easily have been employed as an introductory particle, even though אֲשֶׁר always occupied its present position. As for the construction of the sentence in its present form, we have an exact analogy, e.g., in the Assyrian; cf. Dariâmuš ša bita aga epuš, "Darius is he that has built this house." "Der Relativsatz bildet das Prädikat" (Kraetzschmar, *BA*, I, 426). And just so in our verse. Cf. Zech. 13:6, "And one shall say, What are these wounds between thy hands? and he shall say [אֲשֶׁר הֻכֵּיתִי בֵּית מְאַהֲבַי], I was beaten in the house of my lovers." This is at any rate possible, though אֲשֶׁר has been variously treated. LXX with slavish literality: ἃς ἐπλήγην; Vulg.: *His plagatus sum;* R.V.: "Those with which"; Nowack considers אֲשֶׁר as purely introductory. I prefer this view, though it is not the only possible one—אֲשֶׁר may be causal. In this case, the sentence must be regarded as elliptical, the thought to be supplied from the context being "I have these wounds," to which the אֲשֶׁר-clause would furnish the reason. Neh. 4:6 is also sometimes referred to (Siegfried) as containing an instance of אֲשֶׁר *recitativum* but the syntax is doubtful.

b) אֲשֶׁר IN COMPOUNDS

145. *BDB* says: "Combined with prepositions, אֲשֶׁר converts them into conjunctions." This is, of course, a well-known fact. But it must be borne in mind that the אֲשֶׁר is, as a rule, not indispensable. Prepositions as such may subordinate an entire clause, in other words assume the function of a conjunction. "Statt des vermittelnden אֲשֶׁר tritt der ganze folgende Satz als *ein* Substantivbegriff unter die unmittelbare Rektion der Präposition."[1] Indeed, in some cases the preposition used as a conjunction is never accompanied by אֲשֶׁר, e.g., בְּטֶרֶם and מֵאָז. Cf. Ps. 90:2, בְּטֶרֶם הָרִים יֻלָּדוּ, "before the mountains were brought forth"; Exod. 5:23, מֵאָז בָּאתִי אֶל פַּרְעֹה, "since I came to Pharaoh." בְּטֶרֶם

[1] Gesenius-Kautzsch, § 104*c;* cf. also Stade, p. 225; Olshausen, pp. 441 f.; König, II, 327 f.

אֲשֶׁר or מֵאָז אֲשֶׁר are not found. On the other hand, some prepositions are only in the rarest instances used immediately as conjunctions. Thus מִן in Deut. 33:11, מִן־יְקוּמוּ, "that they rise not up," where מִן is equivalent to מֵאֲשֶׁר. Olshausen further instances מִן־הוּא in Isa. 18:2: "wo das . . . . הוּא die Stelle eines ganzen Satzes vertritt." So also Cheyne: "since it arose." Delitzsch and Duhm take the expression locally, the former declaring that מִן־הוּא cannot be used for מֵאֲשֶׁר הוּא. But this takes for granted the very thing that is under discussion. The temporal-conjunctional sense is best suited to the context. The preposition לְ is probably never found as a conjunction. לְתִתֵּן in I Kings 6:19 is plainly a scribal error. But in Gen. 30:41 Olshausen would read (*vielleicht*) לְיַחֲמִנָה instead of לְיַחֲמִינָה, thus making לְ introduce a finite verb. בְּ is employed as a conjunction in Lam. 4:14, בְּלֹא יוּכְלוּ; cf. König, III, 395*e*. Is כְּ ever used for כַּאֲשֶׁר? This is almost uniformly denied. Delitzsch remarks on Job. 7:2: "כְּ kann nie einen Vergleichungssatz einführen ausser einen infinitivischen . . . . geradezu steht es nie für כַּאֲשֶׁר." So most of the grammars. But König (III, 388*d*) puts his finger on at least one passage in which כְּ introduces a comparative clause, viz., Jer. 31:10, "He shall keep it [שְׁמָרוֹ] [כְּרֹעֵה עֶדְרוֹ] as a shepherd [*sc.* יִשְׁמֹר] his flock." This is the most natural and obvious construction. I also think that König is right when he remarks on Obad., vs. 16, כְּלֹא הָיוּ, that "als wären sie nicht gewesen" is "geistreicher" than "wie solche, die nicht existiert haben." In other words, the view that כְּ is a conjunction = כַּאֲשֶׁר deserves the preference to the other which regards the clause as relative. So also Nowack: "Als wären sie nicht gewesen," and G. A. Smith: "As though they had not been"; cf. Job 10:19, כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא הָיִיתִי אֶהְיֶה, "I should have been as though I had not been." There are other passages which plainly show that the dividing line between כְּ and כַּאֲשֶׁר was at least partially obliterated; cf. I Chron. 17:9 (II Sam. 7:10), "The children of wickedness shall not waste them any more [כַּאֲשֶׁר בָּרִאשֹׁנָה], as at first"; Jer. 33:7, "I will build them [כְּבָרִאשֹׁנָה], as at first"; cf. also Jer. 33:11; Isa. 1:26, "I will restore thy judges [כְּבָרִאשֹׁנָה] and thy counselors [כְּבַתְּחִלָּה] as at the beginning." The same promiscuous use is noticeable also after nominal sentences;

cf. I Kings 13:6, "And the king's hand was restored again [וַתָּשָׁב כְּרִאשֹׁנָה], and it became as it was before"; Gen. 41:21, "Their appearance was evil [כַּאֲשֶׁר בַּתְּחִלָּה] as it was before."

146. If, then, כְּ and כַּאֲשֶׁר are at times used interchangeably, we are justified in re-examining a certain class of passages in which the conjunctional character of כְּ is commonly denied. Such examination has made it clear to me that כְּ is often treated as a preposition, where in reality it is a conjunction. What are evidently two distinct types of sentence are promiscuously thrown together. For the sake of illustration, I shall call attention to a few passages: Job 11:16, "For thou wilt forget misery [עָמָל] [כְּמַיִם עָבְרוּ תִּזְכֹּר], thou wilt remember it as waters [that] have passed away"; Jer. 23:29, "Is not my word like a fire [וּכְפַטִּישׁ יְפֹצֵץ סָלַע] and like a hammer [that] breaketh the rock in pieces?" It is plain here that כְּ is not a conjunction, since the things compared are in each case two mere substantives. כְּ belongs only to the word to which it is immediately prefixed. But now let us look at some other passages, which are cast in a different mold: Job 7:2, ... כְּעֶבֶד יִשְׁאַף צֵל כֵּן הָנְחַלְתִּי", "as the servant panteth for the shadow, so am I made heir [to months of wretchedness]"; Ps. 42:2, כְּאַיָּל תַּעֲרֹג עַל אֲפִיקֵי־מַיִם כֵּן נַפְשִׁי תַעֲרֹג", "as the hind panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul [after thee, O God]." It will be seen that in these two examples it is not so much the subjects that are paralleled, but rather the two *actions* expressed by the verb. If we insist that the first member of the verse last quoted be rendered, "Like the hind [that] panteth," etc., the second member should consistently be rendered, "so [is] my soul [that] panteth," etc. This alone will save the concinnity of thought and expression. To put it differently, if כֵּן belongs to the second verb, כְּ belongs to the first. Further examples illustrating these two kinds of sentences can easily be found; cf. Hos. 6:3; Isa. 62:1; Ps. 125:1; 83:15–16; Isa. 61:11.

147. Whatever view one holds with reference to the function of כְּ, it remains true, upon the whole, that אֲשֶׁר is not an essential element in the so-called compound conjunctions. As in English, the same particle may, as a rule, perform the functions both of a preposition and of a conjunction; cf. "after his arrival" and "after

he had arrived." And, to carry the comparisons a step farther, the Hebrew אֲשֶׁר, when united with a preposition, was felt probably to be no more specific or significant than the conjunctional affix "that," which, especially in older English, often follows the (prepositional) conjunction; cf. "The word of Jahwe came to Jeremiah, after that the king had burned the roll"; "Before that Abraham was, I am" (Wycl. John 8:58). So also "ere that," "till that," "since that," etc. And further, just as in Hebrew the אֲשֶׁר may not always be dispensed with, so this conjunctional affix "that," though it has almost disappeared from modern English, still maintains its place in certain connections; cf. "in that" (German *indem*). "In" alone never subordinates a sentence. To acquire conjunctional force it must unite itself with "that"; cf. "Let him die, in that he is a fox." This corresponds to the Hebrew בַּאֲשֶׁר, used as a causal conjunction.

148. We shall now take up the various compounds in which אֲשֶׁר appears as an element. By far the most common is כַּאֲשֶׁר, which occurs hundreds of times throughout the Old Testament. We may, therefore, begin with a discussion of the grammatical phenomena connected with it.

כַּאֲשֶׁר *in Comparative Clauses*

149. There are many passages in which the אֲשֶׁר does not unite with כְּ to form a compound conjunction (to retain the conventional phraseology), but in which it performs its ordinary function as a relative particle; cf. Gen. 27:4, "Make me savory food [כַּאֲשֶׁר אָהַבְתִּי], such as I love" (lit. "according to what I love"); Gen. 41:21, "Their appearance was evil [כַּאֲשֶׁר בַּתְּחִלָּה] as at first" ("according to what [it was] at first"). Sometimes the copulative verb is added; cf. Isa. 11:16, "There shall be a highway for the remnant of his people [כַּאֲשֶׁר הָיְתָה לְיִשְׂרָאֵל], like the one that was for Israel"; Josh. 14:7, "I brought him word again [כַּאֲשֶׁר עִם לְבָבִי] as it was in my heart"; Josh. 14:11, "I am yet strong to-day [כַּאֲשֶׁר בְּיוֹם שְׁלֹחַ אוֹתִי] as I was on the day that [Moses] sent me"; Judg. 11:36, "Do unto me [כַּאֲשֶׁר יָצָא מִפִּיךָ] according to that which hath proceeded from thy mouth" (R.V.); I Sam. 24:5, "Thou shalt do unto him [כַּאֲשֶׁר יִיטַב בְּעֵינֶיךָ] according to what is good in thine eyes"; II Kings 7:7, "They left . . . .

their camp [כַּאֲשֶׁר הִיא] as it was," i.e., "according to what [condition] it had been"; II Kings 7:10, ". . . . the tents [כַּאֲשֶׁר הֵמָּה]"; Job 29:4, כַּאֲשֶׁר הָיִתִי, "according to what I was"; Isa. 24:2, כַּנֹּשֶׂה כַּאֲשֶׁר נֹשֶׂא בוֹ, "as with the creditor, so with the debtor"; the retrospective בוֹ plainly shows the relative character of אֲשֶׁר; Jer. 18:4, "He shall make it another vessel [כַּאֲשֶׁר יָשָׁר בְּעֵינֵי] according to one that is right in the eyes of . . . ."; Ezek. 41:25, "They were made [כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּם] like as were made" [R.V.], i.e., "like those that were made"; I Kings 21:11, כַּאֲשֶׁר כָּתוּב בַּסְּפָרִים, "according to what was written in the letters"; Koh. 9:3, כַּאֲשֶׁר שְׁבוּעָה יָרֵא, "as one that feareth an oath"; Dan. 9:13, כַּאֲשֶׁר כָּתוּב; Koh. 5:14, כַּאֲשֶׁר יָצָא . . . . עָרוֹם יָשׁוּב, "as he came forth, naked shall he return again"; the significance of אֲשֶׁר is here plainly indicated by עָרוֹם in the main clause; כַּאֲשֶׁר means literally "as what," i.e., "in what condition or character," *qualis;* Koh. 8:7, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה מִי יַגִּיד לוֹ, "how [i.e., as what] it shall be who will tell him?"; Koh. 9:2, הַכֹּל כַּאֲשֶׁר לַכֹּל, "everything [is] according to what [happens] to all," i.e., "all things come alike to all" (R.V.).

150. Also in the following passages, in which כַּאֲשֶׁר is followed by transitive verbs, it is possible that אֲשֶׁר retained more or less its pronominal function. At any rate, כַּאֲשֶׁר easily resolves itself into "according to," "in correspondence or conformity to that which." That אֲשֶׁר had not so far coalesced with the כְּ as to form an integral part of the compound (in spite of close external union) seems to be plainly indicated by at least one passage: Isa. 14:24, כַּאֲשֶׁר יָעַצְתִּי הִיא תָקוּם, "according to what I have purposed that shall stand." The resumptive הִיא points back to אֲשֶׁר as in ordinary relative clauses. The ordinary mode of emphatic resumption is, however, to use כֵּן as in the first part of the same verse. Just what was the living *Sprachgefühl* in these cases we can no longer positively determine. The English idiom, of course, prefers "as" or "according as."

151. Examples of the class under consideration are exceedingly common. Thus כַּאֲשֶׁר is found very frequently:

a) With צִוָּה, "command": cf. Gen. 7:9, "Two and two they came to Noah [כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה אֱלֹהִים], according to what [as] God

commanded"; vs. 16; Exod. 12:28, "The Israelites did [כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יהוה], according to what Jahwe commanded"; 16:24; 23:15; 34:4; Lev. 8:4; 8:9, 13, 31; 9:1, 21; 10:15, 18; Num. 26:4; 27:11, 22; 31:7, 31, 41, 47; 32:25; Deut. 1:19; 4:5; 5:12, 16, 29, etc. It is also found with the passive: Ezek. 24:18; 37:7, כַּאֲשֶׁר צֻוֵּיתִי.

b) With דבר: cf. Gen. 12:4, "And Abraham went [כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבֶּר], according to what [as] Jahwe had said"; 17:23; 24:19; Exod. 1:17; 7:13, 22; 8:11; 9:12, 35; 12:25, 32; Num. 5:4; 14:17; 17:5; 23:2; 27:23; 32:27; Deut. 1:11, 21; 2:1, etc.

c) With אמר: cf. Gen. 21:1, "And Jahwe visited Sarah [כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמָר] as he had said"; 43:17; Num. 23:30; Josh. 11:9, "And Joshua did unto them [כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמַר־לוֹ יהוה] as Jahwe said unto him"; II Kings 8:19; Joel 3:5; Amos 5:14; Neh. 5:12; II Chron. 21:7.

d) With שבע: cf. Gen. 50:6, "Go up and bury thy father [כַּאֲשֶׁר הִשְׁבִּע יְעֶךָ], according to what [as] he caused thee to swear"; Exod. 13:11; Deut. 2:14; 13:18; 19:8; 26:15; 29:12; Josh. 6:22; Judg. 2:15.

e) With עשה: cf. Gen. 8:21, "I shall no more smite every living thing [כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתִי], according to what [as] I have done"; Lev. 4:20; 16:15; 24:23; Num. 21:34; Deut. 2:12, 22, 29; 3:2, 6; Josh. 4:23; 8:2; 10:1, 28, 30; 23:8; 24:5; Judg. 15:10; I Kings 11:38; II Kings 8:18; 21:3, 20; Jer. 7:14; 44:17; Ezek. 12:11; 16:48; 24:22; Zech. 7:3; Ruth 1:8; Dan. 9:12, כַּאֲשֶׁר נֶעֱשְׂתָה (with passive); II Chron. 21:6.

f) With ראה: cf. Exod. 27:8, כַּאֲשֶׁר הֹרָאָה אֹתְךָ, "according to what one [indefinite subject] has caused thee to see, as has been shown thee"; Job. 4:8, כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי, "according to what I have seen," i.e., "according to my experience"; Jer. 42:2; II Chron. 29:8; 30:7; II Kings 2:19.

g) With שמע: cf. I Sam. 23:11; Jer. 26:11.

h) With פָּטַר: cf. Gen. 40:22; 41:13.

i) With זמם: cf. Deut. 19:19.

j) With נדר: cf. Deut. 23:24.

k) With שלח = command: cf. I Kings 21:11.

l) With חפץ: cf. Jonah 1:14.

m) With עלל: cf. Lam. 1:22.

n) With דמה: cf. Num. 33:56; Isa. 14:24.

152. When there is no reference to an actual fact, but where the idea is general and indefinite, כַּאֲשֶׁר is equivalent to "according to whatever." The action expressed by the verb being in such cases merely potential, the tense employed is naturally the imperfect. Cf. Gen. 34:12, "I will give [כַּאֲשֶׁר תֹּאמְרוּ] according to whatever you may command (R.V.: "according as ye shall say"; LXX: *καθότι ἂν εἴπητε*); Gen. 44:1, "Fill the sacks . . . . [כַּאֲשֶׁר יוּכְלוּן שְׂאֵת], according to whatever they may be able to carry" (R.V.: "as much as they can carry"; LXX: *ὅσα ἐὰν δύνωνται ἆραι*; Vulg.: *Quantum possunt capere*); Exod. 8:23, "We will go . . . . and offer a sacrifice [כַּאֲשֶׁר יֹאמַר אֵלֵינוּ], according to whatever he may command us"; Num. 22:8, "I will bring you word again [כַּאֲשֶׁר יְדַבֵּר יהוה], according to whatever Jahwe may say" (LXX: *ἀποκριθήσομαι ὑμῖν πράγματα ἃ ἂν λαλήσῃ κύριος*; Vulg.: *Quidquid mihi dixerit Dominus;* Kautzsch: "je nachdem Jahwe mich anweisen wird," which hits the sense exactly); I Sam. 2:16, "Take for thyself [כַּאֲשֶׁר תְּאַוֶּה נַפְשֶׁךָ], according to whatever thy soul may desire" (R.V.: "as much as thy soul desireth"; Vulg.: *Quantumcumque desiderat*); Jer. 39:12; Ezek. 46:7; Deut. 16:10; I Sam. 24:5; Lev. 27:14.

153. The imperfect may, of course, also be used when the idea is not indefinite. In this case, it denotes simple futurity or customary and repeated action. Cf. Judg. 7:17, כַּאֲשֶׁר אֶעֱשֶׂה כֵּן תַּעֲשׂוּן, "as I shall do, so shall ye do"; Isa. 10:11; I Sam. 24:14; Exod. 5:13.

154. Regarding the external form of these comparative sentences, the principal proposition, without any accompanying correlative, ordinarily precedes the subordinate clause introduced by כַּאֲשֶׁר. There are, however, many divergent arrangements determined for the most part by a striving for emphasis. Thus: (*a*) The כַּאֲשֶׁר-clause may precede the main sentence; cf. Lev. 8:34, כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה צִוָּה יהוה לַעֲשׂת . . . . , "as has been done [indefinite subject] . . . . [so] Jahwe commanded," etc.; II Kings 17:41, ... כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ הֵם עֹשִׂים"; Jonah 1:14, כַּאֲשֶׁר חָפַצְתָּ עָשִׂיתָ. (*b*) The כַּאֲשֶׁר-clause precedes, while the principal clause is introduced by כֵּן; cf. Lev. 24:19, כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה כֵּן יֵעָשֶׂה לוֹ, "as he has done, so shall it be done unto him"; Num. 14:28, כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתֶּם כֵּן אֶעֱשֶׂה, "as you have said, so will I do"; Num. 36:10; Josh. 10:39; Judg. 1:7;

7:17; II Sam. 3:9; I Kings 1:30; 2:38; Isa. 10:11; 14:24; Ezek. 12:11. (*c*) The principal clause precedes, with כֵּן following the verb; cf. Exod. 7:10, וַיַּעֲשׂוּ כֵּן כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יהוה, "and did so, as Jahwe had commanded"; Exod. 7:20; Josh. 4:8; Ezek. 12:7; Gen. 50:12, ... וַיַּעֲשׂוּ בָנָיו לוֹ כֵּן כַּאֲשֶׁר [כֵּן separated from the verb]; II Sam. 5:25, וַיַּעַשׂ דָּוִד כֵּן כַּאֲשֶׁר. (*d*) Same as *c*, but with כֵּן preceding the verb; cf. Gen. 18:5, כֵּן תַּעֲשֶׂה כַּאֲשֶׁר דִּבַּרְתָּ. (*e*) The main clause precedes as in ordinary cases, but the thought is pleonastically repeated after the כַּאֲשֶׁר-clause; cf. Exod. 7:6, וַיַּעַשׂ מֹשֶׁה . . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יהוה כֵּן עָשׂוּ, "and Moses [and Aaron] did as God had commanded—so did they"; Exod. 12:28; Num. 17:26. (*f*) It occurs also that the principal clause is introduced by וְ; cf. Exod. 16:34, וַיַּנִּיחֵהוּ . . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה יהוה, "As Jahwe commanded [Moses], so [Aaron] laid it up"; Num. 1:19, כַּאֲשֶׁר צִוָּה וַיִּפְקְדֵם, "so he numbered them." LXX, Vulg., Kautzsch, Baentsch (*Handkommentar*) unite the כַּאֲשֶׁר-clause with what precedes. (*g*) Ellipsis of main clause; cf. II Chron. 2:2, הִנֵּה אֲנִי בוֹנֶה [vs. 3] . . . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ עִם־דָּוִד אָבִי, "as thou hast dealt with my father [and didst send him cedars, etc.]—behold I am about to build." The omission of the main clause results in an *anacoluthon*. Vulg. supplies *sic fac mecum*.

155. There is another type of comparative clause in which כַּאֲשֶׁר is equivalent to "according to the fact or circumstance that," the אֲשֶׁר revealing its conjunctional force; cf. Gen. 26:29, ". . . . that thou do us no evil [כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא נְגַעֻנוּךָ וְכַאֲשֶׁר עָשִׂינוּ עִמְּךָ רַק־טוֹב], as we have not touched thee," etc. ("according to the fact that," etc.); Gen. 34:22, ". . . . if every male among us be circumcised [כַּאֲשֶׁר הֵם נִמּוֹלִים], as they are circumcised"; Exod. 2:14, "Thinkest thou to kill me [כַּאֲשֶׁר הָרַגְתָּ אֶת־מִצְרִי], as thou killedst the Egyptian?"; Exod. 40:15, "Thou shalt anoint them . . . . [כַּאֲשֶׁר מָשַׁחְתָּ], as thou anointedst . . . ."; Lev. 4:21, "He shall burn it [כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׂרַף אֶת הַפָּר] as he burnt the bullock"; Lev. 18:28, "That the land vomit you not forth . . . . [כַּאֲשֶׁר קָאָה אֶת־הַגּוֹי], as it vomited forth the people . . . ."; Num. 14:19, "Pardon the iniquity of thy people according to the greatness of the mercy [וְכַאֲשֶׁר נָשָׂאתָה לָעָם הַזֶּה] and according as [to the fact that] thou hast forgiven this people"; Num. 27:13, "Thou also shalt be gathered to

thy people [. . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר נֶאֱסַם] as [Aaron] was gathered"; Deut. 6:16; 30:9; 32:50; Josh. 1:17; 3:17; 4:14; 8:5 (ellipsis of verb); 23:15; Judg. 2:22; I Sam. 15:33; 20:13; II Sam. 7:10 (ellipsis of verb); 7:15; 10:2; 16:19; I Kings 1:37; 3:14; 8:57; 9:2; 9:4; 11:38; 20:34; 23:27; Isa. 10:10 (anacoluthic structure due to the excitement of the speaker); 20:3; 52:14; 66:22 (with participiple); Jer. 2:36; 5:19; 7:15; 12:16; 31:28; 32:42; 44:13; 44:30; 48:13; Ezek. 20:36; 23:18; 43:22; 48:11; Obad., vs. 16; Zech. 8:13, 14; 14:5; Ps. 33:22; I Chron. 17:13; II Chron. 6:16; 7:17; Koh. 11:5; Esther 9:31.

156. We find the same construction, when כַּאֲשֶׁר introduces an action, which, though not real and accomplished, is nevertheless conceived by the imagination as such; cf. Gen. 43:14, כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁכֹלְתִּי שָׁכָלְתִּי, "if I be bereaved, I am bereaved" (R.V.). While this is sufficiently accurate, it must be remembered that there is no condition implied. The bereavement is conceived as being no less certain than if already accomplished. The expression denotes absolute, though reluctant, resignation to unavoidable circumstances. Kautzsch excellently reproduces the thought: "Ich aber—wenn es denn sein muss, nun so bin ich eben verwaist." Very weak Vulg.: *Ego autem quasi orbatus absque liberis ero.* Cf. also Esther 4:16, כַּאֲשֶׁר אָבַדְתִּי אָבַדְתִּי, "if I perish, I perish."

157. If the action of the comparative clause is not represented as being really accomplished (as in the foregoing examples, hence perfect), but merely as *contingent* or *potential*, the verb appears in the imperfect. As might be expected, this is quite common with כַּאֲשֶׁר, which is frequently employed to introduce facts of general experience or common customs. Cf. Exod. 33:11, "And Jahwe spake to Moses face to face [כַּאֲשֶׁר יְדַבֵּר אִישׁ אֶל־רֵעֵהוּ], as a man speaks to his friend"; Lev. 4:10, "He shall take off [the fat, etc.] [כַּאֲשֶׁר יוּרָם מִשּׁוֹר] as it is taken from the ox"; Lev. 24:20, "Eye for eye . . . . [כַּאֲשֶׁר יִתֵּן מוּם בָּאָדָם כֵּן יִנָּתֶן בּוֹ], as he causes [may at any time cause] a blemish in a man, so shall it be rendered unto him" (not: "as he hath caused" [R.V.]; LXX: *καθότι ἂν δῷ*); Num. 11:12, "Carry them in thy bosom . . . . [כַּאֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂא הָאֹמֵן], as the nursing-father carrieth [the suckling]"; Deut. 1:31, "Jahwe bare [כַּאֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂא־אִישׁ אֶת־בְּנוֹ], as a man beareth his son"; Deut. 1:44,

"They pursued them [כַּאֲשֶׁר תַּעֲשֶׂינָה הַדְּבֹרִים], as bees do"; Deut. 8:5, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִסַּר אִישׁ אֶת־בְּנוֹ יהוה מְיַסְּרֶךָּ, "As a man chastens his son, so," etc.; Deut. 12:22, כַּאֲשֶׁר יֵאָכֵל אֶת־הַצְּבִי . . . . כֵּן, "as the gazelle is eaten, so shalt thou eat it"; Deut. 28:29, "Thou shalt be groping at noonday [כַּאֲשֶׁר יְמַשֵּׁשׁ הָעִוֵּר בָּאֲפֵלָה], as a blind man gropeth in the darkness"; Deut. 28:49, "And Jahwe will bring a nation against thee . . . . from the end of the earth [כַּאֲשֶׁר יִדְאֶה הַנָּשֶׁר], as the eagle flies"; Judg. 7:5, כַּאֲשֶׁר יָלֹק הַכֶּלֶב, "as a dog laps"; Judg. 16:9, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִנָּתֵק פְּתִיל, "as a string is broken"; II Sam. 19:4, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִתְגַּנֵּב הָעָם, "as people steal themselves [i.e., steal away] [when they flee in battle]"; II Kings 21:13, ... כַּאֲשֶׁר־יִמְחֶה, "as a man wipeth [a dish]"; Isa. 9:2, כַּאֲשֶׁר יָגִילוּ, "as men rejoice"; Isa. 25:11, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִפְרֹשׂ הַשּׂוֹחֶה, "as the swimmer spreads [his hands]"; Isa. 31:4, כַּאֲשֶׁר יֶהְגֶּה הָאַרְיֵה, "as the lion growls"; Isa. 55:10, כַּאֲשֶׁר יֵרֵד הַגֶּשֶׁם, "as the rain descends"; Isa. 65:8, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִמָּצֵא הַתִּירוֹשׁ, "as the new wine is found"; Isa. 66:20, כַּאֲשֶׁר יָבִיאוּ, "as [the children of Israel] bring [their oblation]"; Jer. 19:11, כָּכָה אֶשְׁבֹּר כַּאֲשֶׁר יִשְׁבֹּר, "so will I break, as one breaks [may at any time break] a potter's vessel"; Jer. 43:12, כַּאֲשֶׁר יַעֲטֶה הָרֹעֶה, "as a shepherd puts on [his garment]"; Ezek. 46:12, "He shall prepare his burnt offerings [כַּאֲשֶׁר יַעֲשֶׂה], as he prepares [on the Sabbath day]"; Amos 2:13, כַּאֲשֶׁר תָּעִיק הָעֲגָלָה, "as a cart presses"; Amos 3:12, כַּאֲשֶׁר יַצִּיל הָרֹעֶה, "as a shepherd rescues"; Amos 9:9, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִנּוֹעַ בַּכְּבָרָה, "as [grain] is sifted"; Mal. 3:17, כַּאֲשֶׁר יַחְמֹל אִישׁ עַל־בְּנוֹ, "as a man spares his son"; Num. 2:17, כַּאֲשֶׁר יַחֲנוּ, "as they encamp"; Jer. 13:11, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִדְבַּק הָאֵזוֹר, "as the girdle cleaves."

158. The comparison may be merely assumed or imaginative; cf. Exod. 10:10, "So may Jahwe be with you [כַּאֲשֶׁר אֲשַׁלַּח אֶתְכֶם], as I shall let you go." The action is here neither completed nor potential. Pharaoh has no thought of allowing Israel to depart. As the principal clause is bitterly ironical, so the comparison is intended to show the vanity of Israel's hopes. Cf. also Deut. 22:26, כַּאֲשֶׁר יָקוּם אִישׁ עַל־רֵעֵהוּ כֵּן הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה, "as if a man should rise against his friend, so is this matter"; an assumed comparison for the

sake of illustration; not: "as when" (Driver, *Tenses*, § 115); the idea of time is unsuitable to the sense; II Sam. 16:23, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִשְׁאַל בִּדְבַר, "as if one should ask," etc.; Isa. 29:8, ... כַּאֲשֶׁר יַחֲלֹם הָרָעֵב, "as if a hungry man should dream [and behold he eateth, but he awaketh, and his soul is empty . . . . so shall the multitude of the nations be that fight against Mt. Zion]"; Isa. 51:13, ". . . . and fearest continually because of the fury of the oppressor [כַּאֲשֶׁר כּוֹנֵן לְהַשְׁחִית], as if he were preparing to destroy?" (Kautzsch: "als zielte er, dich zu vernichten"; R.V. [margin]: "as though"); the question that immediately follows, viz., "and where is the fury of the oppressor?" places the sense of the כַּאֲשֶׁר in this connection beyond a doubt; Ezek. 1:16, כַּאֲשֶׁר יִהְיֶה הָאוֹפַן בְּתוֹךְ הָאוֹפָן, "[Their appearance was] as if a wheel were within a wheel" (Vulg.: *quasi sit rota in medio rotae;* cf. Ezek. 10:10); Amos 5:19, כַּאֲשֶׁר יָנוּס אִישׁ מִפְּנֵי הָאָרִי וּפְגָעוֹ, "as if a man should flee from before the lion and [the bear] meets him" (Vulg.: *Quomodo si fugiat;* LXX: *ὃν τρόπον ἐὰν φύγῃ ἄνθρωπος*); Zech. 10:6, "They shall be [כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא־זְנַחְתִּים] as if I had not cast them off" (Kautzsch: "als hätte ich sie niemals verworfen"); Job 10:19, כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא הָיִיתִי אֶהְיֶה, "as if I had not been, I would be"; Esther 2:20, "For Esther did the command of Mordecai [כַּאֲשֶׁר הָיְתָה בְאֹמְנָה אִתּוֹ], as if she had been under his care"; Mic. 3:3, כַּאֲשֶׁר בַּסִּיר, "as if in a pot" (text doubtful, cf. LXX); Neh. 6:3 (similar to Exod. 10:10).

159. The logical relations between the two members of comparative sentences may be such that כַּאֲשֶׁר has the sense of "in proportion as" (*quo, quanto*) or "in what degree." Cf. Exod. 1:12, וְכַאֲשֶׁר יְעַנּוּ אֹתוֹ כֵּן יִרְבֶּה, "the more they afflicted them, the more they multiplied" (R.V.); *Quantoque opprimebant eos, tanto magis multiplicabantur* (Vulg.).

כַּאֲשֶׁר *in Temporal Clauses*

160. From the original sense of כַּאֲשֶׁר, "according to," "agreeably to the fact that," it was an easy step to the temporal use. To what extent (if any) the comparative idea was still felt by the Hebrew consciousness it is impossible for us to determine. The sentence "Agreeably to the fact that [כַּאֲשֶׁר] he [Abraham] was about to enter Egypt, he said unto Sarai his wife . . . . ," may be, perhaps, just

as close to the Hebrew mode of thought as the purely temporal conception, "when he was about," etc. The English idiom, however, requires a temporal conjunction in the passages in question. According to the context, "when," "as soon as," "after" are found to be the proper equivalents of כַּאֲשֶׁר. The nearest approach to the Hebrew conjunction is the Latin *simulatque*, though the use of the latter is more limited. The Vulg. employs *cum, postquam, ut* (in the sense of *simulatque*), *ablative absolute* with little discrimination; LXX: *ἡνίκα, ὡς, μετὰ τὸ* with infinitive, etc. Examples: Gen. 12:11, ... וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר הִקְרִיב לָבוֹא . . . . וַיֹּאמֶר (referred to above); Gen. 18:33, ... וַיֵּלֶךְ יהוה כַּאֲשֶׁר כִּלָּה לְדַבֵּר, "And Jahwe went his way as soon as [R.V.] he had left off communing [with Abraham]"; Gen. 20:13, וָאֹמַר . . . . וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר הִתְעוּ אֹתִי אֱלֹהִים, "And it came to pass, when [the time is more generally indicated than in the foregoing example] God caused me to wander, that I said [unto her]"; Gen. 24:22, וַיִּקַּח . . . . לִשְׁתּוֹת . . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר כִּלּוּ . . . . הָאִישׁ, "as soon as they [the camels] had done drinking, the man took . . . ."; the action of the main clause follows *immediately* upon that of the subordinate; yet Vulg. has *postquam;* Gen. 24:52, ... אֶת־דִּבְרֵיהֶם . . . . וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמַע עֶבֶד וַיִּשְׁתַּחוּ, "when [as soon as] the servant heard their words . . . ."; Gen. 27:30, בֹּא . . . . וְעֵשָׂו . . . . וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר כִּלָּה יִצְחָק לְבָרֵךְ, "as soon as [R.V.] Isaac had made an end of blessing . . . ."; the parenthetical clause "Jacob having just gone out" shows that the action of the principal sentence follows immediately upon that of the כַּאֲשֶׁר-clause (Vulg.: *Vix Isaac sermonem impleverat*); Gen. 29:10, וַיִּגַּשׁ . . . . אֶת־רָחֵל . . . . וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאָה, "and it came to pass, as soon as [R.V.: "when"] he saw Rachel, that he drew near"; Gen. 30:25, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר יָלְדָה רָחֵל אֶת־יוֹסֵף וַיֹּאמֶר יַעֲקֹב, "when Rachel had born Joseph"; Gen. 32:3, וַיֹּאמֶר יַעֲקֹב כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאָם, "And Jacob said, when he saw them"; Gen. 32:32, ... וַיִּזְרַח־לוֹ הַשֶּׁמֶשׁ כַּאֲשֶׁר עָבַר, "and the sun rose upon him, when he had passed over"; Gen. 37:23, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר־בָּא יוֹסֵף אֶל־אֶחָיו וַיַּפְשִׁיטוּ . . . . , "And it came to pass, as soon as [Vulg. *ut* (=*simulac*) *pervenit*] Joseph came to his brethren . . . ."; "as soon as" is here preferable to "when" (R.V.); Gen. 43:1, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר כִּלּוּ . . . . וַיֹּאמֶר, "And it came to pass, when they

had eaten up [made an end of eating] . . . ." (Vulg.: *consumptis cibis*); Exod. 32:19, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר קָרַב . . . . וַיַּרְא אֶת־הָעֵגֶל, "And it came to pass, when he drew near . . . . that he saw the calf" (R.V.: "as soon as"; but the idea of immediateness is not necessarily implied; Kautzsch: "Als er nun in die Nähe kam"); Deut. 2:16, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר־תָּמוּ כָל־אַנְשֵׁי הַמִּלְחָמָה . . . . וַיְדַבֵּר יהוה אֵלַי, "and it came to pass, when [or after] . . . ." (Vulg.: *postquam* . . . . *ceciderunt*); Josh. 4:1, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר־תַּמּוּ . . . . וַיֹּאמֶר יהוה, "when the people had completely passed over . . . ."; Josh. 4:11; 5:8; Judg. 3:18, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר כִּלָּה לְהַקְרִיב . . . . וַיְשַׁלַּח, "when he had made an end of offering"; Judg. 8:33, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר מֵת גִּדְעוֹן וַיָּשׁוּבוּ, "and it came to pass as soon as Gideon was dead, that . . . ." (Vulg.: *postquam*); Judg. 11:5, וַיֵּלְכוּ . . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר נִלְחֲמוּ; Judg. 16:22, וַיָּחֶל שְׂעַר־רֹאשׁוֹ לְצַמֵּחַ כַּאֲשֶׁר גֻּלָּח, "And the hair of his head began to grow, after it had been shaven" (R.V.: "After he was shaven"); I Sam. 1:24, וַתַּעֲלֵהוּ עִמָּהּ כַּאֲשֶׁר גְּמַלַתּוּ, "when [as soon as] she had weaned him"; I Sam. 6:6, הֲלֹא כַּאֲשֶׁר הִתְעַלֵּל בָּהֶם וַיְשַׁלְּחוּם, "when he made a mock of them"; I Sam. 8:1, ... וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר זָקֵן . . . . וַיָּשֶׂם, "when [time only indicated in a general way] he [Samuel] was old . . . ." (Vulg.: *cum senuisset*); I Sam. 12:8, כַּאֲשֶׁר־בָּא . . . . וַיִּזְעֲקוּ אֲבֹתֵיכֶם, "when he came," etc.; I Sam. 24:2, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁב . . . . וַיַּגִּידוּ, "and it came to pass, when [as soon as]," etc. (Vulg.: *postquam*); II Sam. 12:21, ... קַמְתָּ . . . . וְכַאֲשֶׁר מֵת, "but after [the child] was dead," etc. (Vulg.: *puero mortuo;* Kautzsch: *nachdem*); II Sam. 16:16, וַיֹּאמֶר . . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר בָּא, "when he came," etc.; II Sam. 20:12, כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאָה, "when he saw"; II Sam. 20:13, כַּאֲשֶׁר הֹגָה עָבַר . . . . , "when he was removed," etc.; II Kings 14:5, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר חָזְקָה הַמַּמְלָכָה . . . . וַיַּךְ, "and it came to pass, as soon as," etc.; Isa. 23:5, כַּאֲשֶׁר־שֵׁמַע לְמִצְרַיִם יָחִילוּ, "when the report [cometh] to Egypt they shall writhe" (the action of both clauses lies in the future; Vulg.: *Cum auditum fuerit, dolebunt*); Isa. 26:9 (similar to preceding example); Jer. 38:29, וְהָיָה כַּאֲשֶׁר נִלְכְּדָה יְרוּשָׁלִַם . . . . וַיָּבֹאוּ, "and it came to pass, when Jeremiah was taken . . . ."; Jer. 39:4, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאָם . . . . וַיִּבְרְחוּ, "and it came to pass, as soon as [Zedekiah and the men of war] saw them . . . ."; Ezek. 16:50, וָאָסִיר אֶתְהֶן כַּאֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי, "And I took

them away, as soon as I saw [it]"; or, perhaps, "according to what I saw" (with a causal *nuance*) (Vulg.: *sicut vidisti* [evading the difficulty by using second person]); Koh. 8:16, כַּאֲשֶׁר נָתַתִּי אֶת־לִבִּי . . . . וְרָאִיתִי, "when I applied my heart . . . . then I saw" (note the perfect in main clause; without ו in II Sam. 20:13 see above); Neh. 3:33, וַיִּחַר לוֹ . . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמַע סַנְבַלַּט, "as soon as Sanballat heard, he was wroth." Precisely the same in Neh. 4:1; Neh. 4:6, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר־בָּאוּ . . . . וַיֹּאמְרוּ, "And it came to pass, when . . . ."; Neh. 4:9, וַנָּשׂוּב . . . . וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמְעוּ, "and it came to pass, when . . . ."; Neh. 5:6, וַיִּחַר לִי . . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְתִּי, "I was wroth . . . . when I heard"; Neh. 6:16, וַיְהִי . . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר שָׁמְעוּ וַיִּרְאוּ, "and it came to pass, when they heard . . . ."; Neh. 7:1, וַאֲעַמִּיד . . . . וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר נִבְנְתָה, "and . . . . , when [the wall] was built . . . ."; Neh. 13:19, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר צָלְלוּ וָאֹמְרָה . . . . , "as soon as it grew dark . . . ."; I Chron. 17:1, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר יָשַׁב . . . . וַיֹּאמֶר, "and . . . . , when . . . ."; II Chron. 25:3, וַיַּחֲרֹג . . . . וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר חָזְקָה, "as soon as . . . ." (Kittel: "Sobald er die königliche Gewalt fest in Händen hatte); Ps. 51:2.

161. Temporal כַּאֲשֶׁר may, of course, also appear with the *imperfect*, though the instances are comparatively rare. Examples: Gen. 27:40, ... וְהָיָה כַּאֲשֶׁר תָּרִיד וּפָרַקְתָּ עֻלּוֹ, "and it shall come to pass, when" (text doubtful; cf. *SBOT*); Gen. 40:14, כִּי אִם־זְכַרְתַּנִי אִתְּךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר יִיטַב לָךְ, "when it shall be well with thee" (for first part of verse, see Driver, *Tenses*, § 120*d*); Exod. 17:11, וְהָיָה כַּאֲשֶׁר יָרִים . . . . יָדוֹ וְגָבַר יִשְׂרָאֵל וְכַאֲשֶׁר יַנִּיחַ יָדוֹ וְגָבַר עֲמָלֵק, "and it came to pass, whenever he [Moses] lifted up his hand Israel prevailed"; כַּאֲשֶׁר here indicates *repeated action* in the past (LXX: ὅταν ἐπῆρε); Ezek. 35:11, וְנֹדַעְתִּי בָם כַּאֲשֶׁר אֶשְׁפָּטֵךְ, "I will make myself known among them, when I shall judge thee"; Hos. 7:12, כַּאֲשֶׁר יֵלֵכוּ אֶפְרוֹשׂ עֲלֵיהֶם רִשְׁתִּי, "when they shall go, I shall spread my net upon them"; Koh. 4:17, שְׁמֹר רַגְלְךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר תֵּלֵךְ אֶל־בֵּית הָאֱלֹהִים, "guard thy foot, when thou goest to the house of God"; Koh. 5:3, כַּאֲשֶׁר תִּדֹּר נֶדֶר . . . . אַל תְּאַחֵר לְשַׁלְּמוֹ, "when thou vowest a vow, do not defer its fulfilment"; Ezek. 37:18, כַּאֲשֶׁר יֹאמְרוּ . . . . דַּבֵּר, "when they say . . . . say unto them."

כַּאֲשֶׁר *in Causal Clauses*

162. A כַּאֲשֶׁר-clause may stand in such relation to the main clause as to indicate a ground or reason. Examples: Num. 27:14, "Thou shalt be gathered to thy people as Aaron thy brother was gathered [vs. 13] [כַּאֲשֶׁר מְרִיתֶם פִּי], because ye rebelled against my word"; the punishment is represented as *commensurate with* the rebellion; such, at least, is the original idea (Vulg.: *Quia;* LXX: *διότι*); Judg. 6:27, וַיְהִי כַּאֲשֶׁר יָרֵא אֶת־בֵּית . . . . וַיַּעַשׂ, "and it came to pass, because he feared . . . . by day, that he did it [by night]" (LXX: *ὡς ἐφοβήθη*); I Sam. 8:6, "And it displeased Samuel [כַּאֲשֶׁר אָמְרוּ], because they said [Give us a king]" (Vulg.: *Eo quod dixissent;* LXX: *ὡς εἶπαν*); I Sam. 28:18, ... כַּאֲשֶׁר לֹא־שָׁמַעְתָּ . . . . עַל־כֵּן, "because thou didst not obey . . . . therefore . . . ."; the עַל־כֵּן plainly reveals the causal force of כַּאֲשֶׁר; I Kings 3:6, "Thou hast shown great favor to David my father [כַּאֲשֶׁר הָלַךְ לְפָנֶיךָ], because he walked before thee in truth," etc. (LXX: *καθὼς διῆλθεν*; Vulg.: *sicut ambulativit*); but mere comparison does not exhaust the sense; there is a distinct causal connotation; Kautzsch: "wie er denn auch" is good, making the causal relation less close and prominent than *weil*, "because"; II Kings 17:26, "Behold they are killing them [. . . . כַּאֲשֶׁר אֵינָם יֹדְעִים אֶת־מִשְׁפַּט], because they are not knowing the law," etc. (LXX: *καθότι*; Vulg.: *eo quod ignorent*); Hag. 1:12, "And Zerubbabel . . . . obeyed the voice of Jahwe and the words of Haggai the prophet [כַּאֲשֶׁר שְׁלָחוֹ יהוה], because Jahwe had sent him" (LXX: *καθότι*; Vulg.: *sicut*); Ps. 56:7, "They mark my steps [כַּאֲשֶׁר קִוּוּ נַפְשִׁי], because they have waited for my soul" (R.V. [margin]: "inasmuch as").

בַּאֲשֶׁר

163. בַּאֲשֶׁר is sometimes employed as a causal conjunction in the sense of "in that," "inasmuch as," "seeing that," "because," "in view of the fact that." Examples: Gen. 39:9, "He has not kept back from me anything except thee [בַּאֲשֶׁר אַתְּ־אִשְׁתּוֹ], in that thou art his wife" (R.V.: "because"; LXX: *διὰ τὸ σὲ γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ εἶναι*); Gen. 39:23, "The prison-keeper looked not to anything that was in his charge [בַּאֲשֶׁר יהוה אִתּוֹ], in that Jahwe was with him" (R.V.: "because"); Koh. 7:2, "It is better to go to the house of mourning

than to the house of feasting [בַּאֲשֶׁר הוּא סוֹף כָּל־הָאָדָם], in that this is the end of all men" (R.V.: "for"; Kautzsch: *denn;* Delitzsch: *sintemal;* Siegfried: *indem*); Koh. 8:4, "Persist not in an evil thing, for he [the king] doth whatsoever he will [vs. 3] [בַּאֲשֶׁר דְּבַר מֶלֶךְ שִׁלְטוֹן], in that the king's word hath power" (R.V.: "for");[1] Koh. 8:17, בְּשֶׁל אֲשֶׁר [=Aramaic בְּדִיל דְּ], "because of the fact that," "because."

עַל אֲשֶׁר

164. עַל אֲשֶׁר, properly "on the ground that," "on the basis of the fact that," is employed to introduce subordinate clauses expressing the cause or motive of the main action. Examples: Exod. 32:35, "And Jahwe smote the people [עַל אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ אֶת־הָעֵגֶל], because they had made the calf"; Num. 20:24, "He [Aaron] shall not enter into the land . . . . [עַל אֲשֶׁר־מְרִיתֶם אֶת־פִּי], because ye rebelled against my command"; Deut. 29:24, "Men shall say [עַל אֲשֶׁר עָזְבוּ אֶת־בְּרִית יהוה . . . . וַיִּחַר־אַף יהוה], because they forsook the covenant of Jahwe . . . . therefore the anger of Jahwe was kindled"; Deut. 32:51, "Be gathered unto thy people as Aaron . . . . [vs. 50] [עַל אֲשֶׁר מְעַלְתֶּם בִּי . . . . עַל אֲשֶׁר לֹא קִדַּשְׁתֶּם], because ye trespassed against me . . . . because ye did not sanctify me"; I Sam. 24:6, "The heart of David smote him [עַל אֲשֶׁר כָּרַת אֶת־כְּנַף], because he had cut off the skirt [of Saul]"; II Sam. 3:30, "Joab and Abishai slew Abner [עַל אֲשֶׁר הֵמִית אֶת־עֲשָׂהאֵל], because he had killed Asahel"; II Sam. 6:8, וַיִּחַר לְדָוִד עַל אֲשֶׁר פָּרַץ יהוה, "because Jahwe had broken forth upon Uzzah"; II Sam. 8:10, "And Toi sent Joram unto king David to salute him . . . . [עַל אֲשֶׁר נִלְחַם בְּהַדַדְעֶזֶר], because he had fought against Hadad-ezer"; II Sam. 12:6, "And the lamb he shall restore fourfold [עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה וְעַל אֲשֶׁר לֹא־חָמָל], because he did this thing and because he had no pity"; the interchange here between עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר and עַל אֲשֶׁר shows that both conjunctions have practically the same meaning, though the original conceptions are different (see under עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר); II Sam. 21:1, "Upon Saul . . . . [rests] blood guiltiness [עַל אֲשֶׁר־הֵמִית אֶת־הַגִּבְעֹנִים], because

[1] בַּאֲשֶׁר לְמִי in Jonah 1:8 = "because of whom," *cuius causa*, and is patterned after the model of the Aramaicized form בְּשֶׁלְמִי in vs. 7. Cf. also vs. 12, בְּשֶׁלִּי, "because of me," "on my account," *mea causa*.

he slew the Gibeonites"; I Kings 9:9, "And they shall say . . . . [עַל אֲשֶׁר עָזְבוּ אֶת־יהוה . . . . עַל־כֵּן הֵבִיא], because they forsook Jahwe . . . . therefore he brought this evil upon them"; I Kings 16:7, "The word of Jahwe came against Baasha . . . . [עַל אֲשֶׁר־הִכָּה אֹתוֹ], because he smote him." The remaining passages are the following: II Kings 18:12; 22:13; Jer. 16:11; 22:9; Ezek. 23:30; 35:15; 39:23; Ps. 119:49; Job 32:3; Esther 1:15; 8:7; I Chron. 13:10; 18:10; II Chron. 7:22; 34:21. In II Chron. 34:25 תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר is employed in exactly the same sense as עַל אֲשֶׁר in similar passages: "I am about to bring evil upon this place . . . . [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר עֲזָבוּנִי], because they have forsaken me." In Jer. 15:4 the אֲשֶׁר following עַל has pronominal force: "I will make them a consternation to all kingdoms of the earth because of Manasseh [עַל אֲשֶׁר־עָשָׂה בִירוּשָׁלִם], because of what he did in Jerusalem."

165. Sometimes אֲשֶׁר is dispensed with, עַל alone having the force of a conjunction; cf. Gen. 31:20; Ps. 119:136; Ezra 3:11; II Chron. 29:36.[1]

166. In two instances עַל is used concessively; cf. Isa. 53:9, עַל לֹא־חָמָס עָשָׂה, "although [notwithstanding the fact that] he had done no violence"; Job 16:17, עַל לֹא־חָמָס בְּכַפָּי, "although no violence is in my hands." For a similar concessive use of the prepositional עַל cf. Job 10:7, עַל־דַּעְתְּךָ, "despite thy knowing that," etc.; i.e., "although thou knowest"; Job 34:6, עַל־מִשְׁפָּטִי אֲכַזֵּב, "Notwithstanding my right I am accounted a liar."

עַל־דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר

167. עַל דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר signifies properly "because of the matter[2] that." In the actual *usus loquendi* the דְּבַר has become so colorless as to make the expression practically equivalent to עַל אֲשֶׁר; cf. Deut. 22:24, "Ye shall stone them . . . . the damsel [עַל־דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר לֹא־צָעֲקָה . . . . וְאֶת־הָאִישׁ עַל־דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר־עִנָּה . . . .], because she cried not . . . . and the man because he humbled [forced] [the wife of his neighbor]"; Deut. 23:5, "An Ammonite or a Moabite

[1] The first three passages are overlooked by Budie, *Die hebr. Präposition* עַל, p. 68.

[2] For this use of דָּבָר cf. Gen. 12:17, עַל־דְּבַר שָׂרַי; 20:11, עַל־דְּבַר אִשְׁתּוֹ; 43:18, עַל־דְּבַר הַכֶּסֶף; Exod. 8:8, עַל־דְּבַר הַצְּפַרְדְּעִים, etc. The אשר-clause, it will be seen, simply depends, as a single idea, on the construct דְּבַר.

shall not enter into the assembly of Jahwe . . . . [vs. 4] [עַל־דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר לֹא קִדְּמוּ אֶתְכֶם], because they met you not [with bread and with water]," etc.; II Sam. 13:22, "For Absalom hated Ammon [עַל־דְּבַר אֲשֶׁר עִנָּה], because he had forced [his sister Tamar]."

עַל־כָּל־אֹדוֹת אֲשֶׁר

168. אֹדוֹת is a *plurale tantum* in the sense of "circumstance," "reason," "occasion," though occurring nowhere alone, but always in conjunction with עַל. Cf. Gen. 21:11, עַל אֹדוֹת בְּנוֹ, "on account of his son"; Gen. 21:25, עַל־אֹדוֹת בְּאֵר הַמַּיִם, "on account [because] of the well of water" (Vulg.: *propter puteum aquae*); Gen. 26:32, "They made known unto him [עַל־אֹדוֹת הַבְּאֵר] concerning [the matter of] the well"; Exod. 18:8, "And Moses related unto his father-in-law all that Jahwe had done . . . . [עַל אֹדוֹת יִשְׂרָאֵל], on account of [for the sake of] Israel"; Num. 12:1; 13:21, etc.

169. As a conjunction עַל אֹדוֹת does not occur; nor does עַל אֹדוֹת אֲשֶׁר, though Wynkoop enumerates this combination among the causal conjunctions (*Syntax*, p. 106). The only compound in which אֹדוֹת appears as an element is עַל־כָּל־אֹדוֹת אֲשֶׁר, which introduces an emphatic causal sentence. The exact force is, according to Ges., *Thes.*, *has ipsas ob causas quod*, "for the very reason that," "eben deshalb weil"; cf. Jer. 3:8, וָאֵרֶא כִּי עַל־כָּל־אֹדוֹת אֲשֶׁר נָאֲפָה מְשֻׁבָה יִשְׂרָאֵל שִׁלַּחְתִּיהָ . . . . וְלֹא יָרְאָה, "And I saw that—for the very reason that backsliding Israel had committed adultery, I put her away and gave her a bill of divorcement—Judah did not fear," etc. For the construction of the entire verse cf. König, III, 414*a*, 360*b*, and Keil, *Comm. on Jer.*

עַל־פִּי אֲשֶׁר

170. עַל־פִּי, lit., "according to the command, or mouth" (cf. Gen. 45:21, עַל־פִּי פַרְעֹה, "according to the command of Pharaoh"; Exod. 17:1, עַל־פִּי יהוה), is frequently employed in the sense of "according to the measure of," "in proportion to," "in conformity with"; cf. Lev. 27:18, עַל־פִּי הַשָּׁנִים, "in proportion to the years," "according to the years" (R.V.) (Vulg.: *juxta*); Exod. 34:27, כִּי עַל־פִּי הַדְּבָרִים הָאֵלֶּה, "for after the tenor [R.V.] of these words [I have made a covenant]." The conjunction occurs but once.

Cf. Lev. 27:8, עַל־פִּי אֲשֶׁר תַּשִּׂיג יַד הַכֹּהֵן, lit., "according to the measure of what his hand can reach," i.e., "according as he may be able."

כְּפִי אֲשֶׁר

171. This compound occurs once: Mal. 2:9, "I have made you despised and abased [כְּפִי אֲשֶׁר אֵינְכֶם שֹׁמְרִים] according as ye have not kept my ways" (R.V.). But doubtless the idea of cause predominates over that of comparison, notwithstanding the outward form כְּפִי אֲשֶׁר seems to have here essentially the same sense as causal כַּאֲשֶׁר already discussed. Kautzsch: "Weil ihr ja," etc.

172. כְּפִי is found alone in Zech. 2:4, "These are the horns which have scattered Israel [כְּפִי אִישׁ לֹא־נָשָׂא רֹאשׁוֹ], according to a degree [that] none lifted up his head." The sense is consecutive. Wellhausen and Nowack read אֲשֶׁר instead of אִישׁ and make Judah the subject of נָשָׂא.

יַעַן אֲשֶׁר

173. יַעַן אֲשֶׁר is more limited in its use than עַל אֲשֶׁר. As a rule, it is not used merely to introduce a cause as such, or to furnish an explanation of some state or condition. This is the proper function of עַל אֲשֶׁר. As will be seen from the examples to follow, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר denotes generally cause and *motive*, and hence presupposes a conscious personal agent (generally the Deity) in the main clause. It is used almost without exception in divine promises or threats. Naturally, therefore, the action of the principal sentence will be in the future. Though this distinction between the two conjunctions is not maintained throughout, it is nevertheless sufficiently marked to arrest the attention and deserve notice. Further details and exceptions will appear in the examples. Examples: Gen. 22:16, "By myself have I sworn that [כִּי] [יַעַן אֲשֶׁר עָשִׂיתָ אֶת־הַדָּבָר הַזֶּה . . . . כִּי־בָרֵךְ אֲבָרֶכְךָ] because thou hast done this thing . . . . I will bless thee" (the resumption of כִּי gives special emphasis to the main clause) (LXX: οὗ εἵνεκεν ἐποίησας; Vulg.: *Quia*). There can be no doubt that יַעַן אֲשֶׁר here expresses more than simply the notion of cause. It is more significant than עַל אֲשֶׁר. It indicates the motive of the main action besides

representing the latter, i.e., the promise of Jahwe, as a *corresponding* recompense for Abraham's obedience. The thought of the writer would be, perhaps, most accurately expressed by rendering, "Answering [corresponding] to the fact that thou hast . . . . I will surely bless thee," though we can no longer tell just to what extent the original idea prevailed. Cf. also Deut. 1:36, "To him [Caleb] will I give the land that he hath trodden upon . . . . [יַעַן אֲשֶׁר מִלֵּא אַחֲרֵי יהוה], because he hath wholly followed Jahwe" (LXX: *διὰ τὸ προσκεῖσθαι αὐτόν* . . . . ; Vulg.: *Quia secutus est*) (the same, but with *perfect* in the main clause, because denoting the fulfilment of the promise, Josh. 14:14, עַל־כֵּן הָיְתָה־חֶבְרוֹן לְכָלֵב . . . . יַעַן אֲשֶׁר מִלֵּא אַחֲרֵי יהוה, "Therefore Hebron became the inheritance of Caleb . . . . because he wholly followed Jahwe"); I Kings 3:11; II Kings 10:30, "And Jahwe said to Jehu [. . . . יַעַן אֲשֶׁר־הֵטִיבֹתָ בְּנֵי רְבִעִים יֵשְׁבוּ לְךָ], because thou hast done well . . . . thy sons of the fourth generation shall sit on the throne of Israel" (LXX: *ἀνθ' ὧν*); Jer. 35:18, "Thus says Jahwe [לָכֵן . . . . יַעַן אֲשֶׁר שְׁמַעְתֶּם לֹא יִכָּרֵת . . . .], because ye have obeyed the commandments of Jonadab . . . . therefore . . . . shall not be cut off," etc. (LXX: *Ἐπειδή*); II Chron. 1:11, "And God said unto Solomon [יַעַן אֲשֶׁר הָיְתָה זֹאת עִם־לְבָבֶךָ . . . . הַחָכְמָה . . . . נָתוּן לָךְ], because this was in thy heart . . . . wisdom and knowledge is given unto thee." It will be seen that יַעַן אֲשֶׁר in all the above examples is used in connection with promises. Similarly, when the main clause contains a threat; cf. Judg. 2:20, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר עָבְרוּ הַגּוֹי הַזֶּה אֶת־בְּרִיתִי גַּם־אֲנִי לֹא אוֹסִיף הוֹרִישׁ (vs. 21) . . . ., "Because this nation has transgressed my covenant . . . . I also will not henceforth drive out . . . ."; I Sam. 30:22, "And they said [יַעַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־הָלְכוּ עִמִּי לֹא נִתֵּן לָהֶם], because they went not with me, we will not give them [of the spoil]"; I Kings 11:11, "And Jahwe said unto Solomon [יַעַן אֲשֶׁר הָיְתָה זֹאת עִמָּךְ . . . . קָרֹעַ אֶקְרַע], because this is with thee . . . . I will rend the kingdom from thee"; I Kings 11:33, "Behold I am about to rend the kingdom from Solomon [vs. 31–vs. 32 is parenthetical] [יַעַן אֲשֶׁר עֲזָבוּנִי], because they have forsaken me"; I Kings 14:7, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר הֲרִימוֹתִיךָ . . . . וְלֹא הָיִיתָ כְּעַבְדִּי דָוִד [vs. 10] . . . . לָכֵן הִנְנִי מֵבִיא, "because I have exalted thee . . . . and thou hast not been like my servant David . . . .

therefore I am about to bring [evil]"; I Kings 14:15; 16:2, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר הֲרִימֹתִיךָ . . . . הִנְנִי מַבְעִיר . . . . , "because . . . . I am about to sweep away"; I Kings 20:28, 36; II Kings 1:16, "Thus says Jahwe [יַעַן אֲשֶׁר־שָׁלַחְתָּ . . . . לֹא תֵרֵד מִמֶּנָּה], Because thou hast sent [messengers to inquire of Baal-zebub] . . . . thou shalt not come down from it" (i.e., "the bed of sickness"); II Kings 21:11, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה מְנַשֶּׁה . . . . הַתֹּעֵבוֹת הָאֵלֶּה . . . . לָכֵן הִנְנִי מֵבִיא רָעָה, "because Manasseh has done these abominations . . . . therefore, behold I am about to bring evil"; II Kings 21:15, "I will cast off the remnant of mine inheritance [vs. 14] . . . . [יַעַן אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ אֶת־הָרַע], because they have done evil"; the main clause containing the threat here has the perfect נָטַשְׁתִּי . . . . נְתַתִּים, which is the prophetic perfect indicating an unalterable resolution; Jer. 19:4, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר עֲזָבוּנִי . . . . לָכֵן הִנֵּה־יָמִים, "because they have forsaken me . . . . therefore, behold, the days [are coming]"; Jer. 25:8, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא שְׁמַעְתֶּם אֶת־דְּבָרַי הִנְנִי שֹׁלֵחַ, "because ye have not obeyed my words, behold, I am about to send . . . ."; Jer. 29:23, הִנְנִי נֹתֵן אֹתָם בְּיַד נְבוּכַדְרֶאצַּר . . . . [vs. 21] . . . . יַעַן אֲשֶׁר עָשׂוּ נְבָלָה, "behold, I am about to deliver them into the hand of Nebuchadrezzar . . . . because they have wrought folly in Israel"; Jer. 29:25 (text may be faulty); Jer. 29:31, "Thus says Jahwe [יַעַן אֲשֶׁר נִבָּא לָכֶם . . . . לָכֵן . . . . הִנְנִי פֹקֵד], because Shemaiah has prophesied unto you . . . . therefore thus says Jahwe, Behold I am about to punish"; Ezek. 12:12, פָּנָיו יְכַסֶּה יַעַן אֲשֶׁר־לֹא יִרְאֶה; the text here does not yield a suitable sense (cf. Kraetzschmar, who reads according to the LXX לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר יִרְאֶה לְעַיִן, "damit er nicht mit Augen gesehen werde"; Keil retains יַעַן אֲשֶׁר, but gives it a telic sense, which it never has; cf. also Toy, *SBOT*); Ezek. 16:43, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא זָכַרְתְּ אֶת־יְמֵי נְעוּרַיִךְ . . . . וְגַם־אֲנִי הֵא דַרְכֵּךְ . . . . נָתַתִּי, "because thou hast not remembered the days of thy youth . . . . I also, behold, will bring [thy way upon thy head]"; Ezek. 31:10, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר גָּבַהְתָּ . . . . וְאֶתְּנֵהוּ, "because thou art exalted in stature . . . . I will deliver him"; Ezek. 44:12, ... יַעַן אֲשֶׁר יְשָׁרְתוּ . . . . עַל־כֵּן נָשָׂאתִי, "because they ministered unto them . . . . therefore I lifted up my hand against them . . . ."; Ps. 109:16, "that he may cut off their memory [יַעַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־זָכַר], because he remembered not [to show kindness]."

174. There is one instance in which the subordinate clause does not refer to any human action, but to a divine resolve: Ezek. 21:9, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר־הִכְרַתִּי . . . . לָכֵן תֵּצֵא חַרְבִּי, "because I will cut off [perfect of prophetic certitude] from thee the righteous and the wicked . . . . therefore my sword shall go forth"; R.V.: "seeing that"; the Vulg. has *pro eo quod*, which probably means here "conformably to the fact that." In German I should render "dementsprechend, dass."

175. Finally, another passage deserves special mention: I Kings 8:18, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר הָיָה עִם־לְבָבְךָ . . . . הֵטִיבֹתָ. It is logically impossible in this verse to take יַעַן אֲשֶׁר, as is generally done, in a causal sense. The main clause is not the result or effect of the יַעַן אֲשֶׁר-clause, but merely pronounces a judgment on it. We cannot render, "Whereas it was in thy heart" (R.V.). The only tolerable sense is secured by rendering "As regarding the fact that . . . . you have done well." This was felt by the Vulg., which, though generally using *eo, quod*, or *quia*, here translates *quod cogitasti . . . . bene fecisti*. For an analogous usage cf. the Greek ἕνεκα, which, though ordinarily employed in the sense of "because of," "on account of," has, besides, the meaning "as regards," "with respect to." It is to be noted also that in the verse in question the main clause has the perfect, the tense of completed action, while ordinarily the principal sentence has the imperfect or its equivalent.

176. As to the external form of these periods, it is to be remarked that the subordinate clause introduced by יען אֲשֶׁר ordinarily *precedes* the main clause. As a matter of fact, out of thirty examples there are only seven in which the secondary clause follows the primary. It is just the reverse in case of עַל אֲשֶׁר. Out of twenty-five examples, there are only three in which the subordinate clause *precedes*. This is due to the fact that עַל אֲשֶׁר is, as a rule, employed in calmer discourse and states the cause objectively, while יַעַן אֲשֶׁר is used almost exclusively in the more emotional language of threats and promises, and hence, for sake of greater emphasis and effect, seeks its position at the beginning of the period. The distinction is, however, as remarked above, not absolute, as a comparison between the two sets of clauses will show.

177. As to the form of the main clause, יַעַן אֲשֶׁר preceding, I have noted the following phenomena: The main clause is introduced: (*a*) by לָכֵן and the imperfect; cf. II Kings 1:16, ... לָכֵן לֹא תֵרֵד ; Jer. 35:19, לָכֵן לֹא יִכָּרֵת ; Ezek. 21:9, לָכֵן תֵּצֵא ; (*b*) by לָכֵן הִנֵּה with the participle; cf. I Kings 14:10, לָכֵן הִנְנִי מֵבִיא ; II Kings 21:12, לָכֵן הִנְנִי מֵבִיא ; Jer. 19:6, לָכֵן הִנֵּה יָמִים בָּאִים ; Jer. 29:31; (*c*) by הִנֵּה alone and the participle; cf. I Kings 16:3, הִנְנִי מַעֲבִיר ; I Kings 20:36, הִנְּךָ הוֹלֵךְ ; Jer. 25:8, הִנְנִי שֹׁלֵחַ ; (*d*) by הִנֵּה and the perfect (prophetic certainty); cf. I Kings 3:11, הִנֵּה עָשִׂיתִי ; (*e*) by גַּם and the imperfect; cf. Judg. 2:20, גַּם אֲנִי לֹא אוֹסִיף ; compare with this (*f*) וְגַם אֲנִי הֵא with the perfect, Ezek. 16:43, נָתַתִּי . . . . וְגַם אֲנִי הֵא ; the use of גַּם indicates the idea of correspondence between the sin and the threat: "Corresponding with what you have done, so I on my part," etc.; (*g*) by עַל־כֵּן with perfect; cf. Ezek. 44:12, עַל־כֵּן נָשָׂאתִי ; (*h*) by וְ and the perfect; cf. I Kings 20:28, בְּיַד־ . . . . וְנָתַתִּי ; (*i*) by וְ and the imperfect; cf. Ezek. 31:10, וְאֶתְּנֵהוּ .

178. Sometimes there is no introductory particle of any kind; cf. I Sam. 30:22; I Kings 11:11; II Chron. 1:11; II Kings 10:30; I Kings 8:18; II Chron. 6:8. In a single instance עַל כֵּן is employed at the beginning of the main clause, the subordinate following; cf. Josh. 14:14, above.

179. For the sake of comparison it may be added here that in the three cases in which עַל אֲשֶׁר *precedes* the primary sentence the latter is introduced by וַ in Deut. 29:27, עַל אֲשֶׁר . . . . וַיִּתֵּר ; by וְ and the perfect, Jer. 16:13, וְהֵטַלְתִּי ; by עַל־כֵּן , I Kings 9:9.

180. Instead of יַעַן אֲשֶׁר , יַעַן alone is frequently used; cf. Num. 20:12, "And Jahwe said unto Moses and Aaron [יַעַן לֹא־הֶאֱמַנְתֶּם בִּי], because you did not believe in me"; I Sam. 15:23, יַעַן מָאַסְתָּ אֶת־דְּבַר יהוה , "because thou hast rejected the word of Jahwe"; I Kings 14:13; Isa. 61:1; 65:12.

עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר

181. This combination is of rare occurrence. The original idea is that of *consequence*. "In consequence of the fact that" is the primary meaning. The action of the main clause is represented

as following, so to speak, on the heels of the subordinate action. By this it is not meant that the underlying figure was consciously perceived in the *usus loquendi*. In the few passages in which it occurs עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר could easily be replaced by יַעַן אֲשֶׁר or עַל אֲשֶׁר, interchanging in fact with the latter in one case. Examples: Gen. 22:18, "In thy seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed [עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר שָׁמַעְתָּ בְּקֹלִי], because [in consequence of, as a return or reward for] thou hast hearkened unto my voice" (LXX: ἀνθ' ὧν [usually also employed in rendering יַעַן אֲשֶׁר]; Vulg.: *quia*); Gen. 26:5 (almost identical with previous example); II Sam. 12:6, "The lamb he shall restore fourfold . . . . [עֵקֶב אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה . . . . וְעַל אֲשֶׁר], because he has done this thing and because he showed no mercy." The change in the conjunction has already been referred to. It may be remarked that the subordinate clause always follows the primary sentence.

182. As in the case of other compounds, אֲשֶׁר may also here be dispensed with; cf. Num. 14:24, עֵקֶב הָיְתָה רוּחַ אַחֶרֶת עִמּוֹ, "because another spirit was with him"; Deut. 7:12, עֵקֶב תִּשְׁמְעוּן, "because ye have hearkened"; Deut. 8:20.

תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר

183. This conjunction really means "instead of the fact that," *anstatt dass*. From this root meaning it has developed into a causal conjunction, corresponding in its usage quite closely with יַעַן אֲשֶׁר. In two passages, however, it accords best with the sense to retain the original meaning; cf. Deut. 28:62, "Ye shall be left few in number [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר הֱיִיתֶם כְּכוֹכְבֵי־], instead of your having been [instead of the fact that you were] like the stars [of heaven]" (R.V.: "whereas"). The Vulg. felt the inappropriateness of a causal construction, and hence renders *Remanebitis pauci numero, qui prius eratis sicut astra caeli;* correctly Kautzsch: "Statt dass ihr vorher . . . . gleichkamt"; Luther, following Jerome: "die ihr vorher . . . . gewesen seid." Cf. also Ezek. 36:34, "And the land that was desolate shall be tilled [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר הָיְתָה שְׁמָמָה], instead of it having been desolate"; Kautzsch: "Anstatt dass es bisher wüste lag"; Vulg., again omitting תַּחַת: *terra deserta fuerit exculta, quae quondam erat desolata.*

184. The other passages that occur are the following: Num. 25:13, "And it shall be unto him the covenant of an everlasting priesthood [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר קִנֵּא לֵאלֹהָיו], because he was jealous for his God" (perhaps there is latent the notion of *in reward* or *return for*, etc.); Deut. 21:14, "Thou shalt not deal with her as with a slave [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר עִנִּיתָהּ], because thou hast forced her"; Deut. 22:29, "And she shall be his wife [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר עִנָּהּ], because he has forced her"; Deut. 28:47, "And they shall be upon thee for a sign and a wonder [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא עָבַדְתָּ], because thou didst not serve Jahwe thy God"; I Sam. 26:21, "I shall do thee evil no more [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר יָקְרָה נַפְשִׁי], because [in return for] my soul was precious [in thy sight]"; II Kings 22:17, תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר עֲזָבוּנִי . . . . וְנִצְּתָה, "because they have forsaken me, therefore my wrath shall be kindled (cf. similar passages under יַעַן אֲשֶׁר); Isa. 53:12, "Therefore [לָכֵן] will I divide him a portion with the great . . . . [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר הֶעֱרָה], because he poured out his soul unto death; note the emphatic לָכֵן, which is unusual if the main clause precedes, though quite common when the natural order is reversed (see the examples under יַעַן אֲשֶׁר); Jer. 29:19, "I shall pursue them . . . . [vs. 18] [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא שָׁמְעוּ], because they have not obeyed my words"; Jer. 50:7, "All those that found them devoured them . . . . [תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר חָטְאוּ], because they sinned against Jahwe"; II Chron. 21:12, תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר לֹא הָלַכְתָּ, "because thou didst not walk . . . . behold Jahwe is about to smite" (הִנֵּה . . . . נֹגֵף); exactly parallel to many passages with יַעַן אֲשֶׁר; the usual order is here reversed for sake of emphasis; II Chron. 34:25, תַּחַת אֲשֶׁר עֲזָבוּנִי . . . . וַתִּתַּךְ, "because they have forsaken me, therefore shall my wrath be poured out . . . ."

185. It will be noticed that the subordinate clause generally follows the main sentence. In only three instances it precedes, viz., II Kings 22:17; II Chron. 21:12; 34:25, and in each case the main clause contains a threat; cf. remarks on יַעַן אֲשֶׁר.

186. As for the tense of the principal sentence, it is usually the simple imperfect. Once the perfect with וְ, II Kings 22:17, not, however, to denote completed action, but fixed purpose. Similarly, there is one instance of וַ with the imperfect, II Chron. 34:25; also

of הִנֵּה with the participle, II Chron. 21:12. These three passages (referred to above) present a divergence from the ordinary structure, due to the reversed order. In one case, however, the main clause contains a perfect of completed action, viz., Jer. 50:7, "All those that found them devoured them [אֲכָלוּם], because they sinned." This is the only case where the main clause looks back to the past instead of forward to the future.

187. Contrary to the general rule, תַּחַת alone is never used as a conjunction.

אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר

188. אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר signifies properly "after the fact that." But it is not, in every instance, a purely temporal conjunction. In most cases, in fact, it has a distinct causal connotation, and is equivalent to "since," which, like the Hebrew conjunction, expresses both time and cause.

189. Examples of strictly temporal use: Josh. 9:16, "And it came to pass at the end of three days [אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר־כָּרְתוּ לָהֶם בְּרִית], after they had made a covenant with them [וַיִּשְׁמְעוּ], that they heard"; Josh. 23:1, "And it came to pass in course of time [אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר־הֵנִיחַ יהוה], after Jahwe had given rest unto Israel . . . . [וַיִּקְרָא], that Joshua called," etc. (LXX: *μετὰ τὸ καταπαῦσαι*; Vulg.: *postquam pacem dederat*); Josh. 24:20, "He [Jahwe] will turn and do you evil . . . . [אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר־הֵיטִיב], after he has done you good." In this case, the tense is equivalent to a future perfect; cf. Vulg.: *postquam vobis praestiterit bona.*

190. In the following examples there is a causal *nuance*, so distinct in a few cases that *after* will not convey the sense.[1] Josh. 7:8, "O Lord, what shall I say [אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר הָפַךְ . . . . עֹרֶף] after Israel has turned the neck?" ("since" could very properly be substituted for "after") (LXX: *ἐπεὶ μετέβαλεν*; Vulg.: *quid dicam videns* [avoiding literality in the interest of clearness]); Judg. 11:36, "Do unto me according to what has proceeded from thy mouth . . . . [אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר עָשָׂה], since Jahwe has wrought [vengeance for thee]" (R.V.: "forasmuch as"; LXX: *ἐν τῷ ποιῆσαι σοι κύριον ἐκδίκησιν*; Vulg.: *concessa tibi ultione* [ablative absolute expressing reason]);

[1] König, III, 387*a*; Davidson, *Syntax*, 145*b*, classify these as simply temporal sentences.

Judg. 19:23, "Do not act wickedly, I pray [אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר־בָּא הָאִישׁ הַזֶּה], since this man [has come into my house]" (R.V.: "seeing that"; LXX, strangely enough: *μετὰ τὸ εἰσελθεῖν*; Vulg.: *quia ingressus est*); II Sam. 19:30, "Let him take all . . . . [אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר־בָּא], since [my lord, the king] has returned [in safety to his house]" (R.V.: "forasmuch as"; LXX: *μετὰ τὸ παραγενέσθαι*; Vulg.: *postquam reversus est*); both versions are here palpably inconsistent as compared with the rendering of similar examples; Deut. 24:4, "He may not take her again [אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר הֻטַּמָּאָה] after she has been defiled" (LXX: *μετὰ τὸ μιανθῆναι*; Vulg.: *quia polluta est*).

191. Instead of אַחֲרֵי אֲשֶׁר, אַחַר אֲשֶׁר occurs in Ezek. 40:1, ". . . . In the fourteenth year . . . . [אַחַר אֲשֶׁר הֻכְּתָה], after the city was smitten."

192. Both אַחֲרֵי and אַחַר may dispense with אֲשֶׁר; cf. Lev. 25:48, אַחֲרֵי נִמְכַּר, "after he has been sold"; I Sam. 5:9, אַחֲרֵי הֻסַּבּוּ אֹתוֹ, "after they had carried it about"; Jer. 41:16, אַחַר הִכָּה, "after he had smitten"; Job 42:7, אַחַר דִּבֶּר יהוה, "after Jahwe had spoken."

193. *Unusual forms:* In Josh. 2:7 we find the strange combination אַחֲרֵי כַּאֲשֶׁר. It seems highly improbable that this is original. The remark of Steuernagel, "wohl Verschmelzung der Lesarten כאשר und אחרי אשר," gives, perhaps, the true explanation, unless אַחֲרֵי be taken as an adverb (cf. אַחַר, which occurs as such). In this case, we could render "afterwards," "when." Cf. Gen. 6:4, ... וְגַם אַחֲרֵי־כֵן אֲשֶׁר יָבֹאוּ בְּנֵי הָאֱלֹהִים, "and also afterwards when [ever] the sons of God came." Skinner suggests the excision of כֵן . . . . וְגַם, and the union of אֲשֶׁר with the preceding בַּיָּמִים הָהֵם. So also Gunkel: "das . . . . den Zusammenhang störende *hernachmals* ist wohl Zusatz eines ängstlichen Lesers," etc. Delitzsch retains: "und auch nachher, da sich gesellten (*atque etiam postea quam*)." But whatever be done with the text, there is no close connection between אשר and the preceding אַחֲרֵי־כֵן. אֲשֶׁר is here used independently in the sense of "when."

עַד אֲשֶׁר

194. עַד אֲשֶׁר *with the imperfect:* עַד אֲשֶׁר with the imperfect denotes a point of time in the *future* at which the action of the main

clause terminates. Since the latter itself usually appears in the future, the imperfect of the subordinate is, in effect, a future perfect. This use of the imperfect is denied by some grammarians (Boettcher, II, 949*c*: "Fiens kein fut. exact"), while others admit it (cf. Gesenius-Kautzsch, 107*l*; König, III, 387*a*). The LXX rendering of these clauses is either ἕως with the *aorist infinitive* or more frequently ἕως ἄν, ἕως οὗ with the subjunctive aorist, which, as is well known, is often equivalent to the Latin future perfect. The English idiom disregarding, as it often does, the exact specification of the time relation between two actions of the future, the future perfect force of the Hebrew imperfect is not always apparent in translation. In the sentence "Wait until I return," the present "I return"="I shall have returned." Similarly in German: "Warte bis ich *zurückkehre*." Nor is it necessary to suppose that the Hebrew imperfect in the clauses to follow was distinctly *felt* as a future perfect. Logically, however, it is such.

195. Examples: Gen. 27:44, "Thou shalt remain with him [עַד . . . . אֲשֶׁר־תָּשׁוּב], until [thy brother's wrath] turn away" (LXX: ἕως τοῦ ἐπιστρέψαι); Gen. 29:8, "We cannot [לֹא נוּכַל] [עַד אֲשֶׁר יֵאָסְפוּ], until all the flocks be gathered"; Gen. 33:14, "I will lead on gently [עַד אֲשֶׁר אָבֹא], until I come to Seir"; Exod. 23:30, "Little by little will I drive them out [עַד אֲשֶׁר תִּפְרֶה] until thou be increased" (LXX: ἕως ἂν αὐξηθῇς); Exod. 24:14, "Remain here [עַד אֲשֶׁר נָשׁוּב אֵלֵיכֶם] until we return to you" (LXX: ἕως ἂν ἀναστρέψωμεν); Lev. 22:4, "He shall not eat of the holy things [עַד אֲשֶׁר יִטְהָר], until he be clean" (LXX: ἕως ἂν καθαρισθῇ); Num. 11:20, "For a month of days [shall ye eat it] [עַד אֲשֶׁר־יֵצֵא מֵאַפֵּכֶם], until it come out of your nostrils" (LXX: ἕως ἂν ἐξέλθῃ); Num. 20:17, "We shall not turn to the right or to the left [עַד אֲשֶׁר נַעֲבֹר], until we have passed [thy border]" (cf. 21:22); Deut. 3:20, "Your wives . . . . shall remain [עַד אֲשֶׁר יָנִיחַ], until Jahwe give rest [unto your brethren]"; Josh. 1:15, "Ye shall pass over armed [עַד אֲשֶׁר יָנִיחַ] until Jahwe have given [R.V.] [your brethren rest]"; I Sam. 22:3, "Let my father and mother go out with you [עַד אֲשֶׁר אֵדַע], until I know [what God will do for me]"; Mic. 7:9, "I will bear the indignation of Jahwe [עַד אֲשֶׁר יָרִיב], until he pleads [my cause]"; Ruth 1:13, "Would you tarry [עַד אֲשֶׁר יִגְדָּלוּ], until they were grown?"; Ruth

3:18, "Sit still, my daughter [עַד אֲשֶׁר תֵּדְעִין], until thou know"; Eccles. 12:1, "Remember thy creator in the days of thy youth [עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא יָבֹאוּ], until the evil days are not [yet] come" (= "before the evil days come") (so also 12:2, 6); Neh. 2:7, "That they [the prefects] permit me to pass through [עַד אֲשֶׁר אָבוֹא], until I come to Judah"; Neh. 4:5, "They shall not know and not see [עַד אֲשֶׁר נָבוֹא], until we come [in the midst of them]"; I Chron. 19:5, "Remain in Jericho [עַד אֲשֶׁר יִצְמַח] until [your beards] be grown."

196. In one instance the perfect is found after עַד אֲשֶׁר, though the time-relation between the main and subordinate clauses is the same as in the above examples: II Sam. 17:13, "We will draw it into the river [עַד אֲשֶׁר־לֹא נִמְצָא] until there be not [even a stone] found [there]." The perfect gives the thought greater emphasis. Similarly, the perfect is found in other compounds than עַד אֲשֶׁר. So after עַד אִם; cf. Gen. 24:19, "I shall draw for thy camels also [עַד אִם־כִּלּוּ], until they have done drinking" (LXX: ἕως ἂν πίωσι [as in similar examples with the Hebrew imperfect]). So also after עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם: Gen. 28:15, "I shall not forsake thee [עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם־עָשִׂיתִי], until I have done that which I said" (LXX: ἕως τοῦ ποιῆσαί με; Vulg.: *nisi complevero*); Num. 32:17, "We ourselves will be ready armed to go before them [עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם־הֲבִיאֹם], until we have brought them to their place"; Isa. 6:11, "And I asked, How long? and he said [עַד אֲשֶׁר אִם־שָׁאוּ], until the cities be waste without an inhabitant."

197. Occasionally the עַד אֲשֶׁר-clause with the imperfect has a *final nuance:* Jonah 4:5, "He sat under it in the shade [עַד אֲשֶׁר יִרְאֶה], till he might see [R.V.] [what would become of the city]"; it will be noticed that the governing clause here is in the past (Vulg.: *donec videret;* Kautzsch: "um abzuwarten, was mit der Stadt geschehen werde"); Eccles. 2:3, "How to lay hold on folly [עַד אֲשֶׁר אֶרְאֶה], till I might see [R.V.] [what was good for the sons of men to do]."

עַד אֲשֶׁר *with the Perfect*

198. עַד אֲשֶׁר with the perfect generally denotes a point of time in the *past* at which the action of the main clause terminates. Since the latter is, in these cases, itself in the past, the perfect of the subordinate clause is, in effect, a pluperfect.

199. Examples: Deut. 2:14, "The days in which we came from Kadesh-Barnea [עַד אֲשֶׁר עָבַרְנוּ], until we [had] crossed the brook Zared"; Josh. 3:17, "And the priests . . . . stood in the midst of the Jordan [עַד אֲשֶׁר תַּמּוּ] until all the nation had completely passed over"; Josh. 8:26, "For Joshua drew not back his hand . . . . [עַד אֲשֶׁר הֶחֱרִים], until he had destroyed [devoted] all the inhabitants of Ai"; I Kings 10:7, "I did not believe the words [עַד אֲשֶׁר־בָּאתִי], until I had come." Kautzsch renders here: "bis ich gekommen bin," as referring to an action completed in the *present*; Vulg.: *donec ipsa veni.* But since the conversation took place *after* the Queen of Sheba had witnessed all of Solomon's glory, the pluperfect may very well be employed.[1] Cf. II Chron. 9:6. Naturally, the LXX in these clauses employs the indicative, since the reference is to a definite past occurrence, e.g., Deut. 2:14, *ἕως οὗ παρήλθομεν*; Josh. 3:17, *ἕως συνετέλεσε.*

200. Sometimes עַד אֲשֶׁר marks the climax or culmination of a certain condition or of a certain line of action rather than the temporal limit of the action of the main clause. In other words, it signifies "to the point or degree that" instead of "to the time that." Examples: I Kings 17:17, "His malady was very grievous [עַד אֲשֶׁר לֹא נוֹתְרָה בּוֹ], until no [breath] was left in him" (R.V.: "His sickness was so sore that there was no breath left in him" [employing a simple consecutive clause]; Vulg.: *ita ut non remaneret;* Kautzsch: "so sehr, dass"); II Kings 17:20, "And Jahwe rejected all the seed of Israel and delivered them . . . . [עַד אֲשֶׁר הִשְׁלִיכָם], until he [definitely] cast them off" (indicating the culmination of the divine chastisements); II Kings 17:23, "And the Israelites walked in all the sins of Jeroboam . . . . they departed not from them [vs. 22] [עַד אֲשֶׁר הֵסִיר יהוה], until Jahwe removed [Israel from his sight]" (the final outcome of Israel's transgressions); II Kings 21:16, "Manasseh shed innocent blood very much [עַד אֲשֶׁר מִלֵּא], until he filled [Jerusalem from one end to another]"; Ezek. 34:21, "Because ye thrust with side and with shoulder [עַד אֲשֶׁר הֲפִיצוֹתֶם], until ye have scattered [them abroad]" (describing the final results of their cruel treatment as a *present condition*); Ps. 112:8, "He shall not be

[1] What has been said with reference to the lax use of English tenses to designate relative time in the *future* applies also to relative time in the *past.*

afraid [עַד אֲשֶׁר יִרְאֶה בְּצָרָיו], until he shall see [his desire] on his adversaries" (in which his security will triumphantly culminate).

201. עַד אֲשֶׁר occurs also in nominal sentences; cf. Exod. 32:20, "and he ground it [the calf] [עַד אֲשֶׁר־דָּק], until it was dust"; I Sam. 30:4, "They wept [עַד אֲשֶׁר אֵין בָּהֶם], until there was no power in them to weep."

202. A very strange combination is עַד אֲשֶׁר־עַד־כֹּה in Josh. 17:14, "And I am a great people" (circumstantial clause), עַד אֲשֶׁר עַד־כֹּה בֵּרַכְנִי. If the text be retained the translation must run "to the degree that Jahwe has thus far [or simply 'thus'] blessed me." The sense is that the greatness is due to a peculiar blessing of Jahwe. But probably we are to read עַל אֲשֶׁר: "I am a great people, because Jahwe has thus far blessed me"; LXX: *καὶ ὁ θεὸς εὐλόγησέ με* (avoiding the difficulty altogether if the text was the same); so also Vulg.: *et benedixerit mihi Dominus.*

203. It need hardly be added that instead of עַד אֲשֶׁר, the simple עַד performs the same function. Cf. Josh. 10:13, עַד־יִקֹּם גּוֹי אֹיְבָיו, "until the people had taken vengeance against its enemies"; Ezek. 39:15, עַד קָבְרוּ אֹתוֹ, "until they had buried him"; Job 32:11; II Chron. 29:34.

לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר

204. לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר signifies "to the intent that," "to the end that"; cf. the Arabic مَعْنًى, *intention, aim, purpose;* cf. also Prov. 16:14, "Jahwe has made everything [לַמַּעֲנֵהוּ] for its own end," in which מַעֲנֵה, the original form of מַעַן, appears in the same sense as in the compound conjunctional form.

205. Examples: Gen. 18:19, "I have known him [לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר יְצַוֶּה אֶת־בָּנָיו] to the end that he may command his children"; Lev. 17:5, "This is the thing which Jahwe has commanded . . . . [vss. 2 ff.] [לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר יָבִיאוּ], to the end that the Israelites bring [their sacrifices]"; Num. 17:4, "As a memorial to the Israelites [לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִקְרַב], to the end that no [stranger] . . . . should draw near"; Deut. 20:18, "You shall destroy them [vs. 17] [לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא יְלַמְּדוּ אֶתְכֶם], that they teach you not"; Deut. 27:3, "Thou shalt write upon them all the words of this law [לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר

תָּבֹא], that thou mayest enter into the land"; Josh. 3:4, "Come not near to it [the ark] [לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר־תֵּדְעוּ], that ye may know [the way]"; II Sam. 13:5, "Let her . . . . prepare food before my eyes [לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר אֶרְאֶה], that I may see it"; Jer. 42:6, "We will obey the voice of Jahwe our God [לְמַעַן יִיטַב־לָנוּ], that it may be well with us"; Ezek. 20:26, "And I polluted them in their own gifts . . . . [לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר יֵדְעוּ], to the end that they might know that I am Jahwe"; Ezek. 31:14, "Upon his ruin all the birds of the heavens shall dwell . . . . [vs. 13] [לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר לֹא־יִגְבְּהוּ], to the end that [the trees] do not exalt themselves."

206. The tense in these final sentences is, of course, always the imperfect.

207. Simple לְמַעַן occurs with greater frequency than לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר; cf. König, III, 396*b*, whose list, though purporting to be complete, omits three of the לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר-passages, viz., Num. 17:5; Deut. 20:18; Ezek. 31:14.

Sporadic Cases of Compounds with אֲשֶׁר

208. There is quite a number of instances in which אֲשֶׁר occurs sporadically (as a rule but once) in conjunction with various prepositional forms. I shall gather these isolated cases into this final paragraph. בַּעֲבֹר אֲשֶׁר occurs in Gen. 27:10, "And thou shalt bring it to thy father [בַּעֲבֹר אֲשֶׁר יְבָרֶכְךָ], that he may bless thee." This is a telic conjunction not essentially different in meaning from לְמַעַן אֲשֶׁר. The etymological sense is, however, "for the gain of," "für den Ertrag von" (König, III, 396*c*). בַּעֲבֹר alone occurs quite frequently both as a preposition ("for the sake of") and as a conjunction. מִאֲשֶׁר occurs in Isa. 43:4, מִאֲשֶׁר יָקַרְתָּ בְעֵינַי, "because [lit., "from the fact that"] thou art precious in my eyes"; cf. the not infrequent causal use of מִן. Sometimes Num. 6:11 is also regarded as exhibiting this use of מֵאֲשֶׁר: "And he [the priest] shall make atonement for him [מֵאֲשֶׁר חָטָא עַל־הַנֶּפֶשׁ], for that he has sinned" (R.V.); Vulg.: *pro eo, quia peccavit.* But it seems preferable to take מִן as a preposition and combine אֲשֶׁר with חָטָא, thus arriving at the following translation: "And he shall make atonement for him from what he has sinned." The sinner in question is to be cleansed *from* his ceremonial uncleanness; cf. Lev. 4:26,

"and the priest shall atone for him [מֵחַטָּאתוֹ] *from* his sin." There are two instances of מִפְּנֵי אֲשֶׁר: Exod. 19:18, "And mount Sinai smoked . . . . [מִפְּנֵי אֲשֶׁר יָרַד], because of the fact that [Jahwe] had descended [upon it in fire]"; lit. "from before the fact that," an originally local conception developing into a causal one; cf. Assyr.: ša ištu pa-an sunḳi bu-bu-te a-na . . . . e-li-u-ni, "who because of want and hunger to . . . . had gone up" (Ashurnaz., II, 7). The second instance is Jer. 44:23, מִפְּנֵי אֲשֶׁר קִטַּרְתֶּם . . . . עַל־כֵּן . . . . , "because you have burned incense . . . . therefore [this great evil has happened unto you]." The compound לְבַד אֲשֶׁר occurs in Esther 4:11. I should not have referred to it at all but for the fact that König (III, 392*e*) translates *ausser wenn*, which is hardly correct. The passage runs: "And Esther gave him a message unto Mordecai: All the king's servants and the people of the king's provinces do know that whosoever, whether man or woman, shall come . . . . who is not called, there is one law for him . . . .," לְבַד מֵאֲשֶׁר יוֹשִׁיט לוֹ הַמֶּלֶךְ אֶת־שַׁרְבִיט. This plainly means "except," or "apart from him, to whom the king shall hold out his [golden] sceptre." The לוֹ retrospective decidedly favors this rendering. אֲשֶׁר is not conjunctional, but pronominal. מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר has a restrictive force: Eccles. 3:11, "He [God] has placed eternity [הָעֹלָם] in their hearts [מִבְּלִי אֲשֶׁר לֹא יִמְצָא הָאָדָם], only that a man cannot find out. . . . ." The לֹא is really pleonastic, since the negation is already contained in מִבְּלִי; cf. *BDB*.

INDEX OF PASSAGES COMMENTED UPON

[The figures refer to sections]

Gen. 4:18 7
Gen. 6: 3 7
Gen. 6: 4 193
Gen. 12:11 160
Gen. 15: 4 65
Gen. 22:16 173
Gen. 22:18 181
Gen. 24:14 119
Gen. 24:22 160
Gen. 24:27 109
Gen. 27: 4 149
Gen. 27:10 208
Gen. 27:30 160
Gen. 27:40 161
Gen. 30:18 109
Gen. 30:29 ..... 100, 143
Gen. 30:38 141
Gen. 30:41 145
Gen. 31:32 88
Gen. 31:49 107
Gen. 37:23 160
Gen. 38:21 21
Gen. 40: 3 72
Gen. 40:13 141
Gen. 41:21 149
Gen. 41:28 69
Gen. 42:29 109
Gen. 43:14 156
Gen. 44: 1 152
Gen. 44: 5 ..... 84, 86
Gen. 44: 9 64
Gen. 44:10 ..... 48, 120
Gen. 45: 4 49
Gen. 46:20 90
Gen. 49: 1 ..... 48, 66

Exod. 1:12 159
Exod. 1:15 77
Exod. 5:11 ..... 20, 22, 24, 26
Exod. 6: 5 79
Exod. 6: 8 76
Exod. 6:21 7
Exod. 10: 6 ..... 87, 142
Exod. 10:10 158
Exod. 12:16 65
Exod. 14:13 142
Exod. 17:11 161
Exod. 18: 9 137
Exod. 18:10 109
Exod. 19: 8 208
Exod. 21:13 117
Exod. 32: 1 113
Exod. 32:19 160
Exod. 32:20 201
Exod. 32:23 113
Exod. 32:33 132
Exod. 32:34 20
Exod. 34:18 142

Lev. 6: 3 78
Lev. 11:21 91
Lev. 18:29 126
Lev. 22: 3 126
Lev. 24:20 157
Lev. 27: 8 170
Lev. 27:24 70

Num. 1:19 154
Num. 5:29 117
Num. 6:11 208
Num. 8:24 61
Num. 9:20 117
Num. 9:21 117
Num. 10:32 74
Num. 17:20 48
Num. 20:13 35
Num. 22: 6 62
Num. 22: 8 152
Num. 25:13 184
Num. 27:14 162
Num. 27:17 113

Num. 32:31 67
Num. 33: 1 141

Deut. 1:31 35
Deut. 3:24 ..... 107, 116
Deut. 4:40 111
Deut. 8:15 35
Deut. 11: 4 137
Deut. 11: 6 137
Deut. 18:22 117
Deut. 20: 5 132
Deut. 22:26 158
Deut. 25:18 137
Deut. 27:26 ..... 48, 62
Deut. 28:20 137
Deut. 28:49 48
Deut. 28:62 183
Deut. 32:46 111
Deut. 33:11 145

Josh. 1: 7 28
Josh. 2: 3 91
Josh. 2: 7 193
Josh. 4: 7 104
Josh. 5: 4 74
Josh. 7: 8 190
Josh. 8:26 80
Josh. 17:14 202
Josh. 22:31 107
Josh. 24:20 189

Judg. 8:15 74
Judg. 9:17 137
Judg. 9:38 80
Judg. 10:18 132
Judg. 11:24 ..... 67, 68
Judg. 11:36 190
Judg. 17: 8 ..... 20, 26, 27
Judg. 17: 9 ..... 20, 26
Judg. 19:23 190

I Sam. 3:11 76
I Sam. 10: 7 69
I Sam. 11: 7 122
I Sam. 15: 2 137
I Sam. 15:15 ..... 107, 108
I Sam. 15:20 144
I Sam. 20:42 107
I Sam. 24:19 ..... 89, 137
I Sam. 25:15 73
I Sam. 26:16 108
I Sam. 28: 9 137
I Sam. 28:18 162

II Sam. 1: 4 144
II Sam. 2: 4 ..... 58, 144
II Sam. 2: 5 108
II Sam. 6:20 109
II Sam. 7: 9 28
II Sam. 12: 6 164
II Sam. 14:26 103
II Sam. 17:13 196
II Sam. 18: 4 69
II Sam. 24:10 83

I Kings 3: 6 162
I Kings 3: 9 53
I Kings 3:13 114
I Kings 3:19 109
I Kings 8: 9 141
I Kings 8:18 175
I Kings 8:23–24 109
I Kings 8:31 117
I Kings 8:39 109
I Kings 9: 7 53
I Kings 10: 7 199
I Kings 11:27 74
I Kings 12: 2 36
I Kings 14:19 143
I Kings 17:17 200
I Kings 19: 1 104
I Kings 21:19 72

II Kings 7: 7 149
II Kings 12: 3 107
II Kings 12: 6 89
II Kings 14:15 143
II Kings 17:20 200
II Kings 17:23 200
II Kings 18:19 52
II Kings 19: 6 74
II Kings 20:20 103
II Kings 23:17 52

Isa. 10:10 155
Isa. 11:16 149

Isa. 14:24 150
Isa. 18: 2 145
Isa. 23: 5 160
Isa. 24:12 149
Isa. 29:22 91
Isa. 41: 8 49
Isa. 43: 4 208
Isa. 47:12 88
Isa. 51:13 158
Isa. 51:17 49
Isa. 53: 9 166
Isa. 53:12 184
Isa. 54: 9 142
Isa. 55: 1 ..... 63, 134
Isa. 56: 4 88
Isa. 64:10 35
Isa. 65: 1 71

Jer. 1:16 137
Jer. 3: 8 168
Jer. 5:22 109
Jer. 11:15 15
Jer. 14: 1 89
Jer. 15: 4 164
Jer. 16:13 109
Jer. 19:11 114
Jer. 23:29 146
Jer. 28: 9 48
Jer. 29:19 141
Jer. 31:10 145
Jer. 32:35 140
Jer. 33:22 142
Jer. 42:14 111
Jer. 48: 8 142
Jer. 49:19 116
Jer. 50: 7 186

Ezek. 1:16 158
Ezek. 6: 9 109
Ezek. 6:11 109
Ezek. 12:12 173
Ezek. 12:25 89
Ezek. 14: 4 124
Ezek. 16:50 160
Ezek. 20:32 136
Ezek. 21: 9 174
Ezek. 34:21 200
Ezek. 36:27 115
Ezek. 36:24 183
Ezek. 39:29 109
Ezek. 47:13 35

Hos. 14:4 107

Amos 5:1 89

Ob. 16 145

Jonah 4:5 197
Jonah 4:10 140

Mic. 3:3 158
Mic. 3:5 64

Zech. 2: 4 172
Zech. 8:23 103
Zech. 11:13 74
Zech. 12:10 88
Zech. 13: 6 144
Zech. 14:17 63

Mal. 2:9 171

Ps. 16:3 98
Ps. 31:8 137
Ps. 34:13–14 133
Ps. 41:9 141
Ps. 42:2 146
Ps. 69:5 141
Ps. 84:4 35
Ps. 95:9 35
Ps. 95:11 114
Ps. 102:28 58
Ps. 112: 8 200
Ps. 139:15 140

Prov. 16:14 204

Job 4: 8 151
Job 7: 2 146
Job 9:16–17 109
Job 10: 7 166
Job 11:16 146

Ruth 1:16 ..... 20, 34
Ruth 1:17 ..... 20, 26
Ruth 2: 2 48

Koh. 3:11 208
Koh. 3:22 103
Koh. 5:14 149
Koh. 6:12 107
Koh. 8:11 107
Koh. 8:12 139
Koh. 8:15 136
Koh. 9: 2 149
Koh. 9: 4 132

Esther 4:11 208
Esther 4:16 140
Esther 9:22 82

Dan. 2:38 25

Ezra 2:1–2 91
Ezra 6: 1 25
Ezra 6:12 55

Neh. 2: 3 107
Neh. 3:35 139
Neh. 5:2–4 116

II Chron. 2: 2 154
II Chron. 10: 2 36
II Chron. 35:20 136